Foreign
Broadcast
Information
Service
50
ANNIVERSARY
1941 - 1991

Daily Report

Near East & South Asia

FBIS-NES-91-212
Friday
1 November 1991

Daily Report
Near East & South Asia

FBIS-NES-91-212 CONTENTS *1 November 1991*

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Madrid Talks

- Participants Deliver Speeches 31 October 1
  - Palestinian Delegation Head *[Amman TV]* 1
  - Lebanese Foreign Minister *[Beirut Radio]* 4
  - Syrian Foreign Minister *[Amman TV]* 8
- Arab Delegations React to Shamir 31 Oct Speech 11
  - 'Ashrawi, al-Husayni *[Amman TV]* 11
  - More 'Ashrawi Remarks *[Amman Radio]* 13
  - Al-Shar' on 'Trite' Shamir Speech *[Damascus Radio]* 14
  - Jordanian—Shamir Speech 'Hardline' *[Amman TV]* 14
  - Musa—Shamir 'Did Not Block' Peace Road *[Amman Radio]* 15
- Israelis React to Arab Delegations' Speeches 15
  - Shamir 'Angry and Furious' *[Tel Aviv Radio]* 15
  - More on al-Shar' Address *[Tel Aviv Radio]* 16
  - Al-Shar's 'Goebbels-Style' Speech *[Jerusalem Radio]* 17
  - 'Hostile' Palestinian Speech *[Jerusalem Radio]* 17
- Participants Deliver Closing Addresses 18
  - Shamir *[Jerusalem Radio]* 18
  - Jordanian Foreign Minister *[Amman TV]* 20
  - 'Abd-al-Shafi Closing Remarks *[Amman TV]* 21
  - Lebanese Foreign Minister *[Beirut Radio]* 23
  - Al-Shar' Final Address *[Damascus Radio]* 24
  - Egyptian Foreign Minister *[Amman TV]* 26
  - EC's Van Den Broek *[Madrid TV]* 27
- Israelis React to Al-Shar' Closing Address 27
  - Al-Shar' Remarks Not 'Relevant' *[Jerusalem Radio]* 27
  - Speech Seen As Being 'Anti-Semitic' *[Jerusalem Radio]* 28
  - 'Cheap Propaganda' *[Jerusalem Radio]* 28
  - Photo of 'Terrorist' Shamir Protested *[Madrid Radio]* 29
- Shamir, Pankin Discuss Opening of Embassies *[Jerusalem Radio]* 29
  - Pankin Proposes Cyprus for Talks *[Jerusalem TV]* 29
- More on Mubarak Letter to Shamir *[Paris Radio Monte Carlo]* 29
- Egypt's Musa Comments Before Meeting Pankin *[London Middle East TV]* 30
  - Role in Bilateral Talks Discussed *[Cairo TV]* 30
  - Views Role in Multilateral Talks *[MENA]* 30
- Bilateral Negotiations Due To Begin 3 Nov *[Madrid TV]* 30
  - Heads of Israeli Teams Named *[Jerusalem Radio]* 31
  - Dispute Over Venue Could Delay Talks *[Jerusalem Radio]* 31
- Israel's Netanyahu Meets With Arab Media *[Jerusalem TV]* 31

Palestinian Affairs

- 'Arafat, Abu-Sharif: Shamir Speech 'Out of Place' 33
  - Shamir's 'Sick Dreams' *[Paris Radio Monte Carlo]* 33
  - 'Old Rhetoric' Scored *[Paris Radio]* 33
- Abu-Sharif Interviewed on Palestinian Stance *[London AL-HAYAH 30 Oct]* 33
- 'Abd-Rabbuh on PLO 'Message to World' *[London TV]* 35
- Qaddumi on Arab Coordination for Madrid Talks *[Algiers VOP]* 36
- Hamas Asserts Opposition to Madrid Conference *[Paris Radio Monte Carlo]* 37

- PFLP Leader Defends Resistance Methods *[Paris TV]* 38

ARAB AFRICA

Algeria

- APS Comments on Madrid Peace Conference *[APS]* 39
- Bendjedid: Elections To Be 'Honest, Clean' *[Algiers Radio]* 39
- Case Against FIS Official Hachani 'Unfounded' *[Algiers Radio]* 40
  - Hachani Released 30 Oct *[Algiers Radio]* 40
- 'No Position' on FIS Role in Elections *[Algiers Radio]* 40
- Islamic Rally Official Withdraws From Meeting *[Algiers Radio]* 40
- Islamic Rally Criticizes Council Decision *[Algiers Radio]* 41
- Relatives of French 'Harkis' Rehabilitated *[Paris International]* 41

Sudan

- Foreign Minister on 'Official Stance' on Conference *[SUNA]* 41
- SPLA Official Views Postponed Peace Talks *[London International]* 41
  - Government Emphasizes Readiness To Negotiate *[SUNA]* 42
  - Commentary on Talks With Rebels *[Omdurman Radio]* 43
- Army Takeover Urged Before 'Purge' Completed *[SPLA Radio]* 43
- Al-Bashir Addresses Ethiopian Representatives *[SUNA]* 44
  - Returns From Addis Ababa *[Omdurman Radio]* 44
- Economic Cooperation Accord Signed With Romania *[SUNA]* 44
- Darfur State To Become Demilitarized Zone *[SUNA]* 45

ARABIAN PENINSULA

Bahrain

- Khalifah, UK's Hogg Voice Support for Peace *[WAKH]* 46

Kuwait

- Foreign Minister States Support for Palestinians *[KUNA]* 46
- Amir Receives Fijian, ICRC Presidents *[Kuwait Radio]* 46

Qatar

- Amir Views Cooperation With UK Secretary Hogg *[WAKH]* 46
  - Hogg Stresses Support for GCC States *[WAKH]* 46

Saudi Arabia

- King Fahd Affirms Support for Madrid Conference *[Riyadh Radio]* 47

Yemen

- President Salih on Madrid, Unity, Gulf War *[London AL-QUDS AL-'ARABI 25 Oct]* 47

IRAQ

- Republican Guard Units Deployed Around Baghdad *[Tehran International]* 49
- National Assembly Condemns Madrid Conference *[INA]* 49
- Palestinians Urged To Oppose Madrid Conference *[Baghdad Voice of Palestine]* 49
- 'Armed Skirmishes' in Al-Sulaymaniyah Quelled *[INA]* 50
- Memo to UN Protests U.S. Aircraft 'Violations' *[Baghdad Radio]* 50
- Bush Claim of Sympathy for Arab Children Scorned *[INA]* 50
- Return of POW's Released by Iran Reported *[INA]* 51
- Saddam Addresses Army Officers at Ceremony *[INA]* 51

- Saddam Inaugurates Baghdad Bridge, Hails Workers *[INA]* 55
- Talabani—Stalemate Means 'No War, No Peace' *[London AL-HAYAH 29 Oct]* 55
- Talabani Protests Turkish Raids Over Kurdistan *[Voice of Kurdistan]* 56
- Saddam Waging 'Economic War' on Kurdish Refugees *[Voice of Iraqi People]* 56
- Talabani, Barzani Sign Bilateral Accord *[Voice of Iraqi People]* 57
- Barzani Opposes 'Arabization' Policy, Urges Peace *[Voice of Iraqi Kurdistan]* 57
- Al-Zubaydi Chairs Meeting on Local Market Situation *[Baghdad Radio]* 57

ISRAEL

- Left, Right React to Shamir's Madrid Speech 58
  - 'General Satisfaction' Seen *[Tel Aviv Radio]* 58
  - Peace Now, Settlers, Tehiya Comment *[Jerusalem Radio]* 58
- Ze'evi on Shamir Speech, Madrid Conference *[Jerusalem TV]* 58
  - Syrian Delegate 'Scored Points' *[Jerusalem Radio]* 59
  - Ze'evi on Shamir Rebuttal *[Tel Aviv Radio]* 60
- Weizman, Peres on Golan, Settlement Issues *[Cairo TV]* 60
  - Peres—Conference 'Opened Door' *[Tel Aviv radio]* 61
- Peace Now—'Real Test' To Come Later *[Jerusalem Radio]* 61
- Activists Leave U.S. Consulate; Kahana Arrested *[Jerusalem Radio]* 61
- Ramallah 'Closed Military Zone' During Peace March *[Jerusalem Radio]* 62
- IDF—Over 7,000 Palestinians Detained, Imprisoned *[HA'IR 1 Nov]* 62

JORDAN

- Interview With King Husayn on Peace Talks *[Amman TV]* 63
- Radio Notes Contrasting Reactions to Peace Talks *[Paris Radio Monte Carlo]* 64
  - Disturbances at Anti-Conference Rally *[AL-DUSTUR 29 Oct]* 64
  - Police Chief Denies Rally 'Sabotaged' *[JORDAN TIMES 31 Oct]* 64
  - Student Strike Turns Into Pro-Peace Rally *[JORDAN TIMES 31 Oct]* 65
- Commentaries on Opening Speeches at Madrid Conference 66
  - SAWT-SHA'B Editorial *[31 Oct]* 66
  - AL-RA'Y Editorial *[31 Oct]* 66
- King, European Parliament President Meet 31 Oct *[Amman Radio]* 67
- Crown Prince Says Regional Issues Directly Linked *[JORDAN TIMES 30 Oct]* 67

LEBANON

- Karami Clarifies Stand on Madrid Talks *[RFL]* 69
  - Country's Water 'Not for Sale' *[Beirut Radio]* 69
- Chamber of Deputies Speaker on Madrid Talks *[Beirut Radio]* 70
  - 'Nothing To Negotiate With Israel' *[VOL]* 71
- Shiite Cleric Scores Madrid Conference Delegates *[Voice of the Oppressed]* 71
- Spanish Consulate in Sidon Hit by Missile *[Tehran Radio]* 71
  - Threatening Call Received 29 Nov *[Tehran Radio]* 72
- U.S. Said Training Groups To Nab Hostage-Takers *[AL-SHIRA' 21 Oct]* 72
- Hostage Captors Concerned Over Possible Reprisals *[AL-SHIRA' 28 Oct]* 72
- Hizballah Reportedly Holding Canadian Since 1985 *[VOL]* 72
- More Hostages To Be Released 'Very Shortly' *[VOL]* 72
  - 'New Steps' Said Imminent *[London AL-HAYAH 29 Oct]* 72
- Iran Said Ready To Withdraw Guard Members *[AL-SHIRA' 21 Oct]* 73
- Overnight Attacks on South; Resistance on Alert *[Voice of the Oppressed]* 73
  - Further on Shelling; al-Nabatiyah Deserted *[Beirut Radio]* 73
  - 15 Wounded *[VOM]* 73
- Syria's Khaddam Arrives; Holds News Briefing *[Damascus TV]* 73
  - More on Visit, News Conference *[Beirut Radio]* 75
- Fatah Official Denies Coup Attempt in Camp *[Voice of the People]* 75
- SLA Leader Rejects Claim of Changing Conditions *[London AL-HAYAH 27 Oct]* 75
- Al-Hirawi Comments on Paris, Rome Talks *[VOL]* 76

SYRIA

Assembly Ratifies Defense Agreement With Lebanon *[Damascus Radio]* 77
Khaddam Returns From Talks in Lebanon 31 Oct *[Damascus Radio]* 77
Territories' Return 'Basic Condition' for Peace *[Damascus Radio]* 77
Commentary Calls For 'Great Efforts' for Peace *[Damascus Radio]* 78

SOUTH ASIA

Bangladesh

Classes Suspended Until 7 Nov at Dhaka University *[Dhaka Radio]* 79
Security Tightened After Ayodhya Incidents 79
    Hindu Areas Patrolled *[AFP]* 79
    Police Disperse Muslim Protesters *[AFP]* 79

India

Security at Ayodhya Tightened; Strike Called *[Delhi Radio]* 80

Iran

PRC's Yang Shangkun Arrives in Tehran 30 Oct *[Tehran Radio]* 80
    Meets With Hashemi-Rafsanjani *[Tehran Radio]* 80
    Discusses Cooperation With Khamene'i *[Tehran TV]* 81
    Ahmad Khomeyni Urges Expanded Ties *[Tehran TV]* 82
    Ties To Reduce U.S. 'Effectiveness' *[Tehran Radio]* 82
    Daily Acclaims Yang's Visit *[IRNA]* 82
Thai Commerce Minister Arrives for Trade Talks *[Tehran Radio]* 83
    Briefs Habibi on ASEAN *[Tehran Radio]* 83
    Economic Memorandum Signed *[Tehran Radio]* 83
Moscow-Tehran Cargo Train Service Resumes *[Tehran Radio]* 83
Musavi-Ardabili Urges Uprising Against Conference *[AFP]* 83
Conference 'Catalyst' for New Regional Tensions *[Tehran Radio]* 83
Media 'Praise' Conference, 'Ignore' Opposition *[Tehran Radio]* 84
Dailies Say Madrid Talks Betray Palestinians *[IRNA]* 84
Karrubi Reiterates Support for Fatah Movement *[Tehran TV]* 85
'Priority' Placed on Improving Ties With Egypt *[Tehran Radio]* 85
    Deputies Reject Upgraded Ties *[IRNA]* 85
IRNA, SUNA Sign Cooperation Agreement *[IRNA]* 85
Reaction to Mohtashemi Threat on Madrid *[Iran's Flag of Freedom]* 86
'Combat Directives' Issued to University Students *[Iran's Flag of Freedom]* 86

Pakistan

Pakistan, India To Discuss Limiting Chemical Arms *[Islamabad Radio]* 86
Scientists Enhance Capacity of Nuclear Reactor *[Islamabad Radio]* 86

Madrid Talks

Participants Deliver Speeches 31 October

Palestinian Delegation Head

JN3110154591 Amman Jordan Television Network in English 1352 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Speech by Dr. Haydar 'Abd-al-Shafi, head of the Palestinian side in the joint Jordanian-Palestinian delegation to the Middle East peace conference, in Madrid on 31 October—live; italicized passages in Arabic]

[Text] *In the name of God, the merciful, the compassionate. O esteemed audience. Allow me first to extend greetings of thanks and appreciation to the State of Spain, king, government, and people, for hosting this historic conference. I would also like to extend greetings of pride and appreciation for the sons of the Palestinian people who are still struggling for freedom and independence. I will now speak on their behalf to you and the various democratic powers in the world in English.*

Mr. Baker, Mr. Pankin, ladies and gentlemen: On behalf of the Palestinian delegation, we meet in Madrid, a city with a rich texture of history, to weave together the fabric which joins our past with future, to reaffirm a wholeness of vision which once brought about a reverse of civilization and a world order based on harmony in diversity. Once again, Christian, Muslim, and Jew face the challenge of heralding a new era enshrined in global values of democracy, human rights, freedom, justice, and security. From Madrid, we launch this quest for peace, a quest to place the sanctity of human life at the center of our world, and to redirect our energies and resources from the pursuit of mutual destruction to the pursuit of joint prosperity, progress, and happiness.

We, the people of Palestine, stand before you in the fullness of our pain, our pride, and our anticipation, for we long harbored a yearning for peace and a dream of justice and freedom. For too long, the Palestinian people have gone unheeded, silenced and denied. Our identity negated by political expediency; our right for struggle against injustice maligned; and our present existence subdued by the past tragedy of another people. For the greater part of this century we have been victimized by the myth of a land without a people and described with impunity as the invisible Palestinians. Before such willful blindness, we refused to disappear or to accept a distorted identity. Our intifadah is a testimony to our perseverance and resilience waged in a just struggle to regain our rights. It is time for us to narrate our own story, to stand witness as advocates of truth which has long lain buried in the consciousness and conscience of the world. We do not stand before you as supplicants, but rather as the torch-bearers who know that, in our world of today, ignorance can never be an excuse. We seek neither an admission of guilt after the fact, nor vengeance for past inequities, but rather an act of will that would make a just peace a reality.

We speak out, ladies and gentlemen, from the full conviction of the rightness of our cause, the verity of our history, and the depth of our commitment. Therein lies the strength of the Palestinian people today, for we have scaled walls of fear and reticence, and we wish to speak out with the courage and integrity that our narrative and history deserve. The cosponsors have invited us here today to present our case and to reach out to the other with whom we have had to face a mutually exclusive reality on the land of Palestine. But even in the invitation to this peace conference, our narrative was distorted and our truth only partially acknowledged.

The Palestinian people are one, fused by centuries of history in Palestine, bound together by a collective memory of shared sorrows and joys, and sharing a unity of purpose and vision. Our songs and ballads are full of tales and children's stories, the dialect of our jokes, the image of our poems, that hint of melancholy which colors even our happiest moments, are as important to us as the blood ties which link our families and clans. Yet, an invitation to discuss peace, the peace we all desire and need, comes to only a portion of our people. It ignores our national, historical, and organic unity. We come here wrenched from our sisters and brothers in exile to stand before you as the Palestinians under occupation, although we maintain that each of us represents the rights and interests of the whole.

We have been denied the right to publicly acknowledge our loyalty to our leadership and system of government. But allegiance and loyalty cannot be censored or severed. Our acknowledged leadership is more than [the] justly democratically chosen leadership of all the Palestinian people. It is the symbol of our national unity and identity, the guardian of our past, the protector of our present, and the hope of our future. Our people have chosen to entrust it with their history and the preservation of our precious legacy. This leadership has been clearly and unequivocally recognized by the community of nations, with only a few exceptions who had chosen for so many years shadow over substance. Regardless of the nature and conditions of our oppression, whether the disposition and dispersion of exile or the brutality and repression of the occupation, the Palestinian people cannot be torn asunder. They remain united—a nation wherever they are, or are forced to be.

And Jerusalem, ladies and gentlemen, that city which is not only the soul of Palestine, but the cradle of three world religions, is tangible even in its claimed absence from our midst at this stage. It is apparent, through artificial exclusion from this conference, that this is a denial of its right to seek peace and redemption. For it, too, has suffered from war and occupation. Jerusalem, the city of peace, has been barred from a peace conference and deprived of its calling. Palestinian Jerusalem, the capital of our homeland and future state, defines Palestinian existence, past, present, and future, but itself has been denied a voice and an identity. Jerusalem defies exclusive possessiveness or bondage. Israel's annexation of Arab Jerusalem remains both clearly illegal in the eyes of the world community, and an affront to the peace that this city deserves.

We come to you from a tortured land and a proud, though captive people, having been asked to negotiate with our occupiers, but leaving behind the children of the intifadah, and a people under occupation and under curfew who enjoined us not to surrender or forget. As we speak, thousands of our brothers and sisters are languishing in Israeli prisons and detention camps, most detained without evidence, charge, or trial, many cruelly mistreated and tortured in interrogation, guilty only of seeking freedom or daring to defy the occupation. We speak in their name and we say: Set them free. As we speak, the tens of thousands who have been wounded or permanently disabled are in pain. Let peace heal their wounds. As we speak, the eyes of thousands of Palestinian refugees, deportees, and displaced persons since 1967, are haunting us, for exile is a cruel fate. Bring them home. They have the right to return. As we speak, the silence of demolished homes echoes through the halls and in our minds. We must rebuild our homes in our free state.

And what do we tell the loved ones of those killed by army bullets? How do we answer the questions and the fear in our children's eyes. For one out of three Palestinian children under occupation has been killed, injured, or detained in the past four years. How can we explain to our children that they are denied education or schools are so often closed by the army fate? [sentence as heard] Or why their life is in danger for raising a flag in a land where even children are killed or jailed? What requiem can be sung for trees uprooted by army bulldozers? And most of all, who can explain to those whose lands are confiscated and clear waters stolen, a message of peace? Remove the barbed wire. Restore to the land and its life-giving water. The settlements must stop now. Peace cannot be waged while Palestinian land confiscated in myriad ways and the status of the occupied territories is being decided each day by Israeli bulldozers and barbed wire. This is not simply a position. It is an irrefutable reality. Territory for peace is a travesty when territory for illegal settlement is official Israeli policy and practice. The settlements must stop now.

In the name of the Palestinian people, we wish to directly address the Israeli people with whom we have had a prolonged exchange of pain: Let us share hope, instead. We are willing to live side by side on the land and the promise of the future. Sharing, however, requires two partners, willing to share as equals. Mutuality and reciprocity must replace domination and hostility for genuine reconciliation and coexistence under international legality. Your security and ours are mutually dependent as entwined as the fears and nightmares of our children. We have seen some of you at your best and at your worst. For the occupier can hide no secrets from the occupied, and we are witness to the toll that occupation has exacted from you and yours.

We have seen you agonize over the transformation of your sons and daughters into instruments of a blind and violent occupation. And we are sure that at no time did you envisage such a role for the children whom you thought would forge your future. We have seen you look back in deepest sorrow at the tragedy of your past, and look on in horror at the disfigurement of the victim-turned-oppressor. Not for this have you nurtured your hopes, dreams, and your offspring. This is why we have responded with solemn appreciation to those of you who came to offer consolation to our bereaved, to give support to those whose homes were being demolished, and to extend encouragement and counsel to those detained behind barbed wire and iron bars. And we have marched together, often choking together in the nondiscriminatory tear gas or crying out in pain as the clubs descended on both Palestinian and Israeli alike, for pain knows no national boundaries, and no one can claim a monopoly on suffering. We once formed a human chain around Jerusalem, joining hands and calling for peace. Let us today form a moral chain around Madrid and continue that noble effort for peace and a promise of freedom for our sons and daughters. Break through the barriers of mistrust and manipulated fears. Let us look forward in magnanimity and in hope.

To our Arab brothers and sisters, most of whom are represented here in this historic occasion, we express our loyalty and gratitude for their life-long support and solidarity. We are here together seeking a just and lasting peace, whose cornerstone is freedom for Palestine, justice for the Palestinians, and an end to the occupation of all Palestinian and Arab lands. Only then can we really enjoy together the fruits of peace, prosperity, security, and human dignity and freedom.

In particular, we address our Jordanian colleagues in our joint delegation: Our two peoples have a very special historic and geographic relationship. Together, we shall strive to achieve peace. We will continue to strive for our sovereignty, while proceeding freely and willingly to prepare the grounds for a confederation between the two states of Palestine and Jordan, which can be a cornerstone for our security and prosperity.

To the community of nations on our fragile planet, to the nations of Africa and Asia, to the Muslim world, and particularly to Europe, on whose southern and neighborly shores we meet today, from the heart of our collective struggle for peace, we greet you and acknowledge your support and recognition. You have recognized our rights and our government, and have given us real support and protection. You have penetrated the distorting mist of racism, stereotyping, and ignorance, and committed the act of seeing the invisible and listening to the voice of the silenced. Palestinians under occupation and in exile have become a reality in your eyes, and with courage and determination, you have affirmed the truth of our narrative. You have taken up our cause and our case, and we have brought you into our hearts. We thank you for caring and daring to know the truth, the truth which must set us all free.

To the cosponsors and participants in this occasion of awe and challenge, we pledge our commitment to the principle of justice, peace, and reconciliation bared on international legitimacy and uniform standards. We shall persist in our quest for peace to place before you the substance and determination of our people, often victimized but never defeated. We shall pursue our people's right to self-determination to the exhilaration of freedom and to the warmth of the sun as a nation among equals.

This is the moment of truth. You must have the courage to recognize it and the will to implement it, for our truth can no longer be hidden away in the dark recesses of inadvertency or neglect. People of Palestine look at you with a straightforward, direct gaze, seeking to touch your heart, for you have dared to stir up hopes that cannot be abandoned. You cannot afford to let us down, for we have lived up to the values you espouse, and we have remained true to our cause.

We, the Palestinian people, made the imaginative leap in the Palestine National Council of November 1988, during which the Palestine Liberation Organization launched its peace initiative based on Security Council Resolution 242 and 338, and declared Palestinian independence based on Resolution 181 of the United Nations, which gave birth to two states in 1948, Israel and Palestine. December 1988, a historic speech before the United Nations in Geneva led directly to the launching of the Palestinian- American dialogue. Ever since then, our people have responded positively to every serious peace initiative and has done its utmost to ensure the success of this process. Israel, on the other hand, has placed many obstacles and barriers in the path of peace to negate the very validity of the process. Its illegal and frenzied settlement activity is the most glaring evidence of its rejectionism, the latest settlement being erected just two days ago. These historic decisions of the Palestine National Council wrench the course of history from inevitable confrontation and conflict towards peace and mutual recognition. With our own hands and in an act of sheer will, we have molded the shape of the future of our people. Our parliament has articulated the message of the people, with the courage to say yes to the challenge of history, just as it provided the reference in its resolutions last month in Algiers and in the Central Council meeting this month in Tunis to go forward to this historic conference. We cannot be made to bear the brunt of other people's noes. We must have reciprocity. We must have peace.

Ladies and Gentlemen: In the Middle East, there is no superfluous people outside time and place, but rather a state sorely missed by time and place. The state of Palestine must be born on the land of Palestine to redeem the injustice of the destruction of its historical reality and to free the people of Palestine from the shackles of their victimization.

Our homeland has never ceased to exist in our minds and hearts, but it has to exist as a state on all the territories occupied by Israel in the war of 1967 with Arab Jerusalem as its capital in the context of that city's special status and its nonexclusive character.

This state, in a condition of emergence, has already been a subject of anticipation for too long, should take place today rather than tomorrow. However, we are willing to accept the proposal for a transitional stage provided interim arrangements are not transformed into permanent status. The time frame must be condensed to respond to the dispossessed Palestinians' urgent need for sanctuary and to the occupied Palestinians' right to gain relief from oppression and to win recognition of their authentic will.

During this phase, international protection for our people is most urgently needed. And the de jure application of the Fourth Geneva Convention is a necessary condition. The phases must not prejudice the outcome. Rather, they require an internal momentum and motivation to lead sequentially to sovereignty. Bilateral negotiations on the withdrawal of Israeli forces, the dissolution of Israeli administration, and the transfer of authority to the Palestinian people cannot proceed under coercion or threat in the current asymmetry of power. Israel must demonstrate its willingness to negotiate in good faith by immediately halting all settlement activity and land confiscation while implementing meaningful confidence-building measures.

Without genuine progress, tangible constructive changes and just agreements during the bilateral talks, multilateral negotiations will be meaningless. Regional stability, security, and development are the logical outcome of an equitable and just solution to the Palestinian question, which remains the key to the resolution of wider conflicts and concerns.

In its confrontation of wills between the legitimacy of the people and the illegality of the occupation, the intifadah's message has been consistent: to embody the Palestinian state and to build its institutions and infrastructure. We seek recognition for this creative impulse which nurtures within it the potential nascent state.

We have paid a heavy price for daring to substantiate our authenticity and to practice popular democracy in spite of the cruelty of occupation. It was a sheer act of will that brought us here; the same will which asserted itself in the essence of the intifadah as the cry for freedom, an act of civil resistance and people's participation and empowerment.

The intifadah is our drive towards nation-building and social transformation. We are here today with the support of our people, who have given itself the right to hope and to make a stand for peace. We must recognize as well that some of our people harbor serious doubts and skepticism about this process. Within our democratic, social, and political structures, we have evolved a respect for pluralism and diversity and we shall guard the opposition's right to differ within the parameters of mutual respect and national unity.

The process launched here must lead us to the light at the end of the tunnel. And this light is the promise of a new Palestine—free, democratic, and respectful of human rights and the integrity of nature.

Self-determination, ladies and gentlemen, can neither be granted nor withheld at the will of the political self-interest of others. For it is enshrined in all international charters and humanitarian law. We claim this right; we firmly assert it here before you and in the eyes of the rest of the world. For it is a sacred and inviolable right which we shall relentlessly pursue and exercise with dedication and self-confidence and pride.

Let's end the Palestinian-Israeli fatal proximity in this unnatural condition of occupation, which has already claimed too many lives. No dream of expansion or glory can justify the taking of a single life. Set us free to reengage as neighbors and as equals on our holy land.

To our people in exile and under occupation, who have sent us to this appointment, laden with their trust, love, and aspirations, we say that the load is heavy and the task is great, but we shall be true. In the words of our great national poet Mahmud Darwish: *My homeland is not a suitcase, and I am no traveler.*

To the exiled and the occupied we say you shall return and you shall remain and we will prevail, for our cause is just. We will put on our embroidered robes and kafiyehs [traditional headdresses] in the sight of the world and celebrate together on the day of liberation.

Refugee camps are not fit for people who were raised on the land of Palestine in the warmth of the sun and freedom. The hail of Israeli bombs almost daily pouring down on our defenseless civilian population in the refugee camps of Lebanon is no substitute for the healing rain of the homeland. Yet, the international will had ensured their return in United Nation Resolution 194—a fact willfully ignored and unenacted. Similarly, all other resolutions pertinent to the Palestinian question beginning with Resolution 181, through Resolutions 242 and 338, and ending with Security Council Resolutions 681, have until now been relegated to the domain of public debate rather than real implementation. They formed a larger body of legality, including all relevant provisions of international law within which any peaceful settlement must proceed. If international legitimacy and the rule of law are to prevail and govern relations among nations, they must be respected and impartially and uniformly implemented. We as Palestinians require nothing less than justice.

Palestinians everywhere: Today we bear in our hands the precious gift of your love and your pain, and we shall set it down gently here before the eyes of the world and say there is a right here which must be acknowledged—the right to self-determination and statehood. There is strength and there is the scent of sacred incense in the air. Jerusalem, the heart of our homeland and the cradle of the soul, is shimmering through the barriers of occupation and deceit.

The deliberate violation of its sanctities is also an act of violence against the collective human, cultural, and spiritual memory and an aggression against its enduring symbols of tolerance, magnanimity, and respect for cultural and religious authenticity.

The cobbled streets of the old city must not echo with the discordant beat of Israeli military boots. We must restore to them the chant of the muezzin, the chimes of the church, the call of the ram, and the prayers of all the faithful calling for peace in the city of peace.

From Madrid let's light the candle of peace and let the olive branch blossom. Let's celebrate the rituals of justice and rejoice in the hymns of truth, for the awe of the moment is a promise to the future, which we all must redeem.

Palestinians will be free and will stand tall among the community of nations in the fullness of the pride and dignity which, by right, belongs to all people. Today, our people under occupation are holding high the olive branch of peace. In the words of Chairman 'Arafat in 1974 before the UN General Assembly: *Let not the olive branch of peace fall from my hands. Let not the olive branch of peace fall from the hands of the Palestinian people.* May God's mercy, peace, and blessings be upon you.

Lebanese Foreign Minister

NC3110161391 Beirut Radio Lebanon in Arabic 1455 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Address by Lebanese Foreign Minister Faris Buwayz to the Middle East peace conference in Madrid—live]

[Text] Mr. James Baker, U.S. secretary of state; Mr. Boris Pankin, Soviet foreign minister; heads of delegations; ladies and gentlemen:

On behalf of His Excellency President Ilyas al-Hirawi and the Lebanese Government, my profound thanks to the Spanish king, government, and people for hosting the conference on this ancient land. I also thank all Spanish authorities and departments for their careful organization and effective arrangements in a short time. They were responding to the parties' unanimous wish to attend the conference in this beautiful capital, Madrid.

This wish demonstrates our and the world's confidence in this great country, home of a rich culture whose splendid landmarks are apparent everywhere. This unanimity embodies the wish of all parties that Spain should be the meeting place of the world's peoples who believe that restraint, right, reason, justice, and peace are the loftiest of civilized standards.

This conference, held under the banner of peace, is a very important one, perhaps the most important since World War II. Peace is humanity's quest, the goal of various nations, and the objective sought by religions, philosophies, and ideologies.

We are aware of the importance of this conference and deeply appreciate the United States' and USSR's immense effort and perseverance to convene it. We also appreciate those countries which helped and which are sincerely contributing to its success.

I wish to note the efforts of Presidents George Bush and Mikhail Gorbachev, who devoted much of their time to this purpose despite other international concerns.

I also wish especially to mention Minister Boris Pankin, who followed and supported efforts to hold the conference, and Secretary James Baker, who devoted his excellent abilities and energies to securing this major achievement. He showed rare skill and persistence.

I would also like to thank Prime Minister Gonzalez for his honorable speech, the EC for its presence, and the prudent stands of its chairman, Hans van den Broek.

Lebanon, which has believed in the message of peace, coexistence, and tolerance, exercized openness and understanding, and embraced the exchange of ideas and knowledge, today welcomes this historic opportunity for peace in a region that is the source of religions, laws, and civilizations, and the birthplace of thought and philosophies. It witnessed Abraham, Christ, Muhammad, the apostles, companions, and prophets. Then came the pyramids, temples, synagogues, churches, and mosques; Jerusalem, Bethlehem, Mecca, and al-Najaf. It is the land where Sumerian, Phoenician, Pharonic, Babylonian, Greek, Byzantine, Ottoman, and Arab cultures interacted, where temples' lines, mosques' columns, and churches' drawings intermingled. It is the land, history, and conscience of the universe. Everyone in the world has part of his identity there. It is the heritage of humanity, and we merely guard its temples and defend the legacy, from which our glory stemmed and we have been entrusted for decades to keep. Lebanon is proud to share its Arab identity with countries sharing the same history, language, culture, and destiny.

Gentlemen, we come to you from a small homeland with a small population, not known for its natural resources, but big in terms of its people's ambitions, rich culture, and great world contribution: the alphabet, science, culture, and knowledge. Our homeland remains a beacon of science in its region, from Beirut's Roman school of law, (Justinianus), (Papinianus), to our universities, poets, and men of science and knowledge.

We come to you from a homeland whose sons have dispersed across the seas and deserts in the direction of the five continents and the various homelands, merging with other people, forging a brotherhood with them, building, and prospering.

We come to you from a homeland that has been the target of other people's designs, where creeds and policies clashed and where civilizations, cultures, and philosophies struggled with each other until it was said that this homeland had vanished. It was torn apart by the wars of others on its territory. It continued to bleed for 16 years until it was said to have died. There were many mourners. The concept of Lebanonization was born, signifying countries dying and nations being torn apart.

Behold Lebanon, being resurrected from its own ashes like the phoenix rising from the flame and giving the lie to those who bet on Lebanon's disappearing, believed it was finished, and played the card of its obliteration.

Behold it today, despite the severity of its wound and the cruelty of its experience, returning to the world community and proving that it is too strong to be canceled, too deep to be obliterated, too anciently noble to be forgotten, too great to expire, and too stable to be merely a temporary or transient homeland.

Here it stands. The waves break on the walls of its sons' will. Here it stands, contrary to all pessimistic expectations, calculations, and analyses. It is as if it alone knows that its destiny is to live on and that its message is to persevere.

If the Lebanese war brought a message, it is that the nature of the Lebanese character will not go away, because it is based on the inevitability of coexistence.

Gentlemen, you have heard much about Lebanon and doubtless you know that this small country practiced and lived the great human experience the world community now aspires to enter. You know that Lebanon encompasses all celestial religions, with all their branches and sects. It has been the ideal opportunity for all political, philosophical, and social ideas and creeds to meet and interact. The atmosphere of democracy and individual and social liberties were the true guarantees to practice, live, and test all those experiences.

We in Lebanon are qualified to enrich the concept of the new world order and consolidate its foundations. We are saying this after our bitter experience that demonstrated the inevitability of coexistence of all ideas, creeds, and religions. Our experience might enrich the concept of the prospective world order. Although the features of this order have not yet been fully clarified, its foundations and bases will undoubtedly be based on the firm facts of communities and on the need for coexistence.

After having paid the price for international and regional conflicts that were reflected on our land, we began the domestic peace process. We have succeeded in making important and basic achievements that surprised everyone, achievements that represented both a challenge and a dream. We began by forming a national reconciliation government that undertook endorsing and implementing the al-Ta'if document. We initiated constitutional reforms that provided a more comprehensive political participation among all segments of the Lebanese structure. The state undertook dissolving the militias and collecting their weapons, removing the artificial barriers among the areas, sects, and parties. Thus, the Lebanese began merging together, rejecting the artificial division. The state began rebuilding administrative, national, and security establishments, unifying the Lebanese Army that deployed in most areas and extended Lebanese authority over most of its territory, and prepared to consolidate its state's sovereignty. All these achievements were made in a very short time and with very humble resources supported by certain brothers and friends. Lebanon proved once again its ability to overcome its ordeals and surprise the world. When the fate of a people is at issue, miracles become possible.

Lebanon has achieved all it could on the domestic level, discrediting numerous pretexts saying that it would be unable to unify and make a national decision. This great march will not bear all its fruits as long as certain problems that have to do with regional and international aspects remain unresolved.

Gentlemen: Events have proven that Lebanon is an indivisible whole: the south, north, al-Biqa', Beirut, and the Jabal Lubnan. The absence of any of its areas is an absence of a basic organ of its body that would keep it bleeding, fumbling, and spreading its wrath throughout the world. This wrath often turned into resistance to the occupation. Thus, acts of violence increased, leaving Lebanese and non-Lebanese victims. This violence has only been an expression, though sometimes painful, of enthusiastic determination to champion our rights.

Events have proven that southern Lebanon in particular is a powder keg that threatens to detonate the entire situation and spread its sons' wrath, as long as it remains under the yoke of occupation and as long as the UN and international legitimacy's resolutions guaranteeing a solution to the problem remain ignored and are not respected.

On this day, and as I am addressing you, 160 Israeli shells have fallen on the steadfast southern town of al-Nabatiyah, leaving a number of civilians dead or wounded. Perhaps the shelling is still going on at this moment. This occupation and the accompanying events and developments cost Lebanon, or rather the entire world, a very high price. In one way or another, every state has paid the price of Israel's occupation of the south.

Gentlemen: Lebanon has been and continues to be a peace-loving country that participated in establishing the United Nations, chaired one of its General Assembly's sessions, contributed toward the foundation of other international organizations, particularly the International Court of Justice—of which Lebanon is a member—and participated in charting human rights laws. Lebanon is committed to international legitimacy and to all resolutions adopted by the UN Security Council and General Assembly, as well as the provisions of international law. Lebanon urges setting up a new world order in which the principles of law, the rejection of aggression, and the solving of disputes by peaceful means prevail.

Lebanon attaches a basic importance to implementing Resolution 425 because the 1949 armistice continues to govern the situation between Lebanon and Israel. The eighth article of the armistice stipulates that this agreement should remain in force until the two sides achieve a peaceful solution. For all these reasons, Lebanon has endeavored and continues to endeavor to implement Resolution 425, adopted by the UN Security Council on 19 March 1976. This resolution calls for full respect of the territorial integrity, sovereignty, and political independence of Lebanon within its recognized international borders, and calls on Israel to halt its military operations against Lebanon's territorial integrity and immediately withdraw its forces from all Lebanese territory.

The resolution established a UN interim force in southern Lebanon to ensure the Israeli forces' withdrawal, consolidate world peace and security, and help the Lebanese Government restore its immediate authority in the region. Resolution 425 met obstacles which prevented its immediate, full, and unconditional implementation—Israel's constant refusal to implement it. These obstacles will only make Lebanon more insistent that it be fully implemented.

Lebanon sees in the resolution a challenge to the international community to prove it is seriously committed to its resolutions. Implementing this resolution will prove that the international community does not have double standards, and that its commitment to international law and independent countries' sovereignty over their territories is not limited to one specific area or case.

I remind you that Lebanon was the first Arab country to denounce the aggression against Kuwait. Lebanon did not prevaricate for a moment, basing its stand on the principle of sovereignty and independence but finding it hard to see international law forcibly applied to a fraternal Arab country, albeit an aggressor.

I stress to you: The Lebanese Government, while wishing this conference full success, will spare no efforts in the endeavor to implement Resolution 425, regardless of the course of this conference and regardless of its final outcome. We informed the countries calling for this conference, the United States and the Soviet Union, that our acceptance is based on this stand.

I praise many friendly countries for supporting our stand, particularly the United States, which told us that Resolution 425 does not depend on a comprehensive solution in the region and is not linked to it, although such a solution would enhance peace and stability in Lebanon.

Resolution 425 is an independent and integral resolution that has a detailed mechanism for its implementation. It is not linked in any way whatsoever to the existing efforts to implement international resolutions on the Arab territories occupied in 1967, particularly Resolutions 242 and 383 [as heard].

While wishing these endeavors quick and complete success, we stress that Lebanon is primarily concerned with liberating all its territory. Lebanon, which does not accept any alternative to Resolution 425, expects the peace efforts and the signs of the new world order to contribute to eliminating the obstacles to implementing this resolution and even end all procrastination in implementing it.

When this resolution is implemented, Lebanon will be fully committed to controlling security on its recognized borders and will not allow any security violations. The justification for resistance to the occupation will then disappear.

As for the borders themselves, they are taken into account by Resolution 425, which is based on the 1949 armistice agreement. They are internationally recognized borders and are in no way subject to negotiation.

Gentlemen: Lebanon is in the Middle East. It has embraced its ideas, ideologies, religions, and philosophies. It has suffered from the conflicts afflicting it. Hence, the Lebanese are probably more aware than others—since their country is the meeting point between East and West and borders the sea—that there can be no real peace in the region except a comprehensive peace for all its regions and countries. None of this region's peoples will enjoy peace when raging volcanoes, oppressed peoples, and violated rights abut their borders.

Lebanon, a constituent and active member of the Arab League, is committed to the Arab cause—especially the Palestinian people's issue and their right to self-determination and to return to their lands—to the liberation of the occupied Arab territories, including Jerusalem, and the achievement of a just peace in the region.

Lebanon wants to stress its solidarity with the Arab stand that aims to implement Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338, the two resolutions that constitute the principal basis for convening this conference—that is, land for peace. Continuing the settlement policy will inevitably have a negative effect on all efforts to achieve peace in the region.

The Palestinian issue is the core of the Middle East conflict. A just and comprehensive solution to it is bound to allow the region to enjoy the stability, security, and confidence it deserves. This applies particularly to our homeland, Lebanon, which paid the highest price for the Palestinian people's expulsion from their land. Lebanon was the target of two major Israeli military incursions in 1978 and 1982, causing immense loss of life and destroying property. I regret to remind you that the Israeli attacks have not stopped.

Lebanon, with its small area—10,452 sq km—its own social, political, and economic makeup, and modest natural resources, has succeeded with difficulty in hosting Palestinian evacuees awaiting a solution to their problem. Lebanon cannot provide these people with a dignified life or permanently absorb them without harming its own domestic situation, provoking struggles and conflicts on its territory over social, economic, employment, and political matters. Lebanon warns against resolving the Palestinian people's problem by settling this fraternal people's sons on a small, densely populated territory, demographically delicate and sensitive. This might turn the struggle for survival into a dangerous affair, and instead of restoring Palestine to its people it might cause Lebanon to be lost.

Resettlement plans disregard people's natural affiliation and attachment to their land, where land is the source of identity, love of homeland akin to religious faith, and a person's origin bound to the soil. Land, according to the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples' belief and philosophy, like that of their Arab brothers, is closely bound to identity, heritage, and ancient origin. Abandoning this origin justifies hate, frustration, and revolt in the minds of these peoples.

Making things worse is uprooting citizens from their homelands and birthplace on various impractical pretexts, separating them from their land, their culture, the soil they tilled, and their achievements, and forcing them, in their hundreds of thousands, to emigrate from a far continent's vast territories to a small, disputed land they have not seen before and with which they have no bond. By this I mean encouraging Soviet citizens to emigrate, uprooting them from their natural society.

Gentlemen: The time is ripe for the Middle East to join the new world order; it is time for the people of this region to enjoy the meaning of peace and make a good living; it is time for this region to return to its noble origins, where religions, civilizations, cultures, and nations coexisted; it is time to tap the tremendous energies of individuals and groups for the sake of development and prosperity; it is time for the region's people to become effective factors in the world order rather than a liability to the region and a source of trouble to its members.

It is high time for this region to become a base of international law and not an exception to it; it is time for this region to again become a crossing point for the continents rather than a barrier to rapprochement. It is time for the people of this region, who are known for their heritage and noble origins, to resume their historic position in exploring the horizons of humanity and charting its future.

The time is ripe for the people of this region to be liberated from the state of harsh permanent mobilization imposed on them that has aborted their natural growth and made them relinquish their potential for the sake of wars and armies. It is time for all people in this region to contribute toward developing the region rather than relying on changing foreign resources for survival.

It is high time for everyone to realize that the balance of powers is not permanent and liable to change; it is time to grab historic opportunities; it is also time for sound assessments to replace futile theories.

We reiterate that there is a historic opportunity for the region's people that will not always be available. The region's people have a real chance to get rid of this situation that required many extraordinary and unique circumstances as well as huge efforts, and perhaps fate.

The duration and intensity of the conflict made people get used to the logic of division and fighting, making people prisoner to this way of thinking. Hence, any leader's wager on peace is worth appreciating and should be supported in confronting rejectionists.

If we miss this unprecedented opportunity and if we lack the courage of those who decide to grab it—those who resist the easy temptation of extremist and aggressive tendencies—we will shoulder the responsibility of history and we will be called to account by future generations.

The alternative for success in reaching peace through this conference is embodied in the conviction that will sweep the region that peace is impossible and openness is futile. This alternative is embodied in the conviction that will sweep the region that the failure of this historic endeavor will close the door to any new efforts in the foreseeable future. It is embodied in the conviction that will sweep the region that political, religious, or factional extremism is the sole means to resist oppression and injustice.

Gentlemen: Let us support the bet of the wise men and let us torpedo the bet on despair, rancor, and wrath. Lebanon, which is emerging from the hell of wars on its territory, is regaining its sovereignty, well-being, and its historic role. Lebanon, which is eager to ensure the success of this conference and to champion rights would like to tell you simply: No to the balance of powers of horror, and yes to the concert of the powers of peace; no to oppression and transgression, yes to storming peace. May God guide our steps and may God's peace be upon you.

Syrian Foreign Minister

JN3110174991 Amman Jordan Television Network in Arabic 1605 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Speech by Faruq al-Shar', Syrian foreign minister and head of Syria's delegation to the Middle East peace conference, in Madrid on 31 October—live]

[Text] Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I would like to begin my speech at the opening session of the peace conference by addressing my thanks to His Majesty King Juan Carlos, and to the government and people of Spain for hosting this historic conference, and for all facilities and care they have offered participating delegations. On behalf of Syria's president, government, and people, I would like to express our deep appreciation to this friendly country, Spain, with which we enjoy deep-rooted historic, human, and cultural ties, whose manifestations are still alive and bright to this very day. I would also like to express my thanks to the two sponsors of the conference, the United States and the USSR, for the determination they have demonstrated to convene this conference on the date proposed by President George Bush and President Mikhail Gorbachev. In this context, I would like to express my appreciation for the great efforts of President Bush, supported by President Gorbachev, efforts which were the preeminent ingredients in giving the peace process an unprecedented momentum and seriousness. Consequently, this conference cannot be considered a mere ceremonial event as one of the participating parties had wanted. Rather, it is an international event, which has aroused interest worldwide. In addition, I cannot fail to recall the sustained personal efforts of Secretary of State James Baker during his eight tours of our region, particularly the important, lengthy, and frank talks he held in Damascus. These talks, by their seriousness and the positive atmosphere surrounding them, have indeed helped make the convening of this peace conference possible.

It must be emphasized at this point that the role of Europe in the peace process is both important and vital, especially since Europe is geographically close to our region. Security in either region cannot fail to affect that of the other, where both regions share common interests. The role of the United Nations, regardless of the status given to it in this conference, remains an important role as long as the objective of the peace process is to achieve a just and comprehensive peaceful settlement within the framework of international legitimacy and on the basis of the UN resolutions, and as long as the results reached by the parties will be sanctioned by the UN Security Council.

The convening of the peace conference in this beautiful country, Spain, evokes boundless symbols, meanings, and images. The peoples of the whole world, and not only the peoples of our region, are buffeted by conflicting feelings toward this conference—feelings fluctuating between success and failure, between optimism over achieving peace and pessimism over a return to confrontation and conflict.

It is no exaggeration to say that the unjustifiable maintenance of the Israeli position is what puts the world on the verge of untold perils and precludes the region's enjoying peace. Throughout their long history, the Arabs have been advocates of peace, justice, and tolerance. As for their old and contemporary history, it is replete with evidence of this. The Jews, especially oriental Jews, more than others, know that they lived among Muslim Arabs in all the homelands that brought them together throughout history without facing any form of persecution or religious or racial discrimination. They always led decent and dignified lives, and contributed to various aspects of life there. They have not known a security, tolerance, and equality that could match the security, tolerance, and equality that they enjoyed on Arab and Muslim lands. He who reads history nowadays realizes the great disparity between this great tolerance and full equality which was observed by the Arabs in their dealings with the Jews throughout hundreds of years on the one hand, and the injustice, repression, and discrimination that the Arabs, particularly the Palestinians, have suffered under the yoke of the Israeli occupation.

It suffices to recall, if recalling could be of any use, that the displacement of millions of Palestinian, Syrian, and Lebanese Arabs outside their lands would have been impossible had the policies of Israel since 1948 been humane. Had Israel's policies been humane, these millions would not have been denied the right to return home up to now. Had Israel's policies not been colonialist and settlement-oriented, the Palestinians living under the yoke of the Israeli occupation since 1967 would not have been denied all of their basic rights, foremost among which is their right to self-determination—this right which they have continued to express, under the very nose of the world, through their peaceful intifadah, which has involved children, women, and elderly people over the past four years.

The continued denial of the Palestinian people's right to self-determination will make this people believe that the recourse to violence alone is the most effective course to attain their rights. The list of evidence testifying to the inhumane Israeli practices is long and documented, a list on which scores of UN resolutions were passed, condemning these practices. These practices are well-known to the Israelis deep down in their hearts. Similarly, several honest Western historians and journalists are aware of these practices. Some of these people, however, do not have the courage to explain them in all frankness and clarity for reasons that are regrettably unknown to large sectors of the European and U.S. public. The first of these reasons is that Jewish fanatics inside and outside Israel pursue these writers and journalists, harass them, jeopardize their lives and future, and charge them with anti-Semitism if they happen to be Christians. But if they happen to be Arabs and Muslims, the easiest thing that these fanatics can do is to accuse them, without any evidence, of terrorism and of intending to destroy Israel. This is because the supply of evidence, according to these fanatics, is to be secured by the defendant in contravention of all norms and laws. Thus, the innocent becomes a defendant in the eyes of large sectors of the Western public. Moreover, the aggressors who have forcibly usurped the lands of others are turned into peace advocates. As for the victims of aggression who are demanding that their occupied lands be restored to them and that their usurped rights be regained, they become terrorists, warmongers, and advocates of destruction.

Mr. President: We have never been warmongers and advocates of destruction. Syria has always called for the attainment of a just and comprehensive peace on the basis of UN resolutions, and it has stressed a true intention and serious desire for peace. At the height of the October war, His Excellency President Hafiz al-Asad said: We have no fondness for killing or destruction; we are only defending ourselves against killing and destruction. We are not and have never been aggressors. We have been and still are defending ourselves against aggression. We want death for no one; we are protecting our people against death. We cherish freedom and want it for ourselves and others.

Peace and the theft of others' territory do not go together. For peace to be permanent and stable, it must encompass all the parties to the conflict on all fronts. Developments in our region have borne out the validity of this truth. Israel used its peace treaty with Egypt to annex Jerusalem in 1980 and the Golan Heights in 1981, and to invade Lebanon in 1982. Obviously, Israel committed this series of aggressive acts at a quicker pace than its withdrawal from Egyptian Sinai. Following each aggression, the UN Security Council convened and issued unanimous resolutions: Resolution 476, which declared the annexation of Jerusalem to be null and void; Resolution 497, which declared the imposition of Israeli laws in the Golan Heights to be null and void and without any basis in international legal authority; and Resolution 425, which demanded an unconditional Israeli withdrawal from Lebanon. But, like Resolutions 242 and 338, these resolutions have failed to be implemented thanks to Israel's rejection and stubbornness and the cold war climate between East and West. As for now, with the cold war over and confrontation and competition between the United States and the USSR giving way to a new era of detente and cooperation, and with the peace conference getting under way, the peoples of the region and the world are waiting for these resolutions to be enforced as soon as possible through serious and productive talks.

In this context, it is worth noting that Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338, which form the foundations of the peace conference, were passed as a compromise among the permanent Security Council members, the majority of which, as is known, have been sympathetic to Israel since its inception. Hence, the implementation of these two resolutions must not be subject to fresh compromises at the bilateral talks. They must be implemented fully and on all fronts. The preamble to Resolution 242 clearly states the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war. This means that every inch of Arab territory occupied by the Israelis through war and force—the Golan Heights, the West Bank and Jerusalem, and the Gaza Strip—must revert to their rightful owners in full.

World public opinion now realizes more than ever before, especially in the aftermath of the Gulf crisis, that double standards are no longer acceptable in this age; that the principles of international law, not the law of the jungle, must be respected; and that the UN resolutions, not brute force, must be put in force. The world states have also recently realized that only Israel resists the peace efforts with all the power at its disposal and continues its occupation of others' territory by force. Today, all states realize that Israel adopts a sterile and worn-out ideology based on expansion, the building of settlements, and the displacement of Arabs from their territories, on which they have lived for centuries, to replace them with new immigrants who have never lived in our region at any time in history.

In this regard, Syria would like to remind the cosponsors of the conference, and through them the international community, that the Israeli occupation of the Syrian and Palestinian territories has led to the displacement of approximately half a million Syrian citizens from the Golan Heights. Those citizens, to date, have not been able to return to their homes. Moreover, there are over a quarter of a million Palestinian refugees in Syria who are deprived of their right to the homeland of their fathers and forefathers in Palestine.

Israel's allegations for bringing world Jewry to it at the expense of the indigenous Arab inhabitants are supported neither by legal nor humanitarian principles. Had the world adopted these allegations, all Christians should have been urged to emigrate to the Vatican and all Muslims to holy Mecca. It is an amazing paradox that Israel rejects the implementation of UN Resolution 194 issued in 1948 stipulating the repatriation of Palestinian refugees and compensating those unwilling to return, on the pretext that there is not enough territory, at a time Israel continues to urge hundreds of thousands of new Jewish immigrants to settle in the same territory and to abandon their original homelands, such as the Soviet Union, which has an area estimated at one-sixth of the world.

We believe that the time of fallacies and meaningless pretexts that are only aimed to justify the continued occupation and annexation is over. All parties, aggressors and victims alike, are now before a historic opportunity, which may not recur, to end long decades of destructive conflict, and to establish a just, comprehensive, and durable peace which would extricate the region from the whirlpool of wars, and signal the beginning of a new epoch in which peoples of the region would devote their efforts to achieve prosperity and development.

A just peace necessitates that no Arab territories remain under Israeli occupation and that the Palestinian people must not remain deprived of their right to self-determination. If the objective, indeed, is for the peoples and states of the region to coexist and to enjoy security, peace, and prosperity, and to place their potential and abundant resources in the service of their economies and development, would it be feasible to achieve this aspired objective without the termination of the occupation and return of rights?

The Arabs have offered much for the sake of peace. They have explicitly announced that they aspire for peace, asking only to enjoy the basic rights that the UN Charter guarantees to all peoples and which the international community and the world at large have acknowledged for any people. As for Israel, it alone of all world states insists on keeping the Arab territories that it occupied by force under the pretext of security, as if geographic expansion can guarantee security in the age of scientific and technological progress. If the world adopts this Israeli logic, how many wars and conflicts would erupt among neighbor countries under this pretext?

The Arabs have responded to the invitation of the two cosponsors of the conference in appreciation for the efforts of these cosponsors and their serious endeavor to work for the attainment of a just and comprehensive peace in the region. But Israel will be commiting a grave mistake if it interprets this Arab response as being a license for it to pursue its intransigent stands within the conference or within any of its committees. Israel will also be committing a great mistake toward itself, let alone anyone else, if it flouts the peace process or the international consensus on reaching a just and comprehensive settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict in accordance with the yardsticks of international legitimacy and the spirit and letter of the UN Charter and its resolutions.

The Syrian Arab delegation has come to this conference in spite of Syria's many reservations on its form and prerogatives to seek a just and honorable peace that comprehensively covers all the aspects and fronts of the Arab-Israeli conflict. Our delegation has come equipped with an inexhaustible reserve of goodwill and a real and serious desire for a just peace, and with a determination to contribute in rendering the peace process a success and having it attain its noble objective. This is balanced by a determination to reject any exploitation of the current peace process to legalize what is not legitimate and what is unacceptable in the eyes of the United Nations, its charter, and its resolutions, or to achieve any gains, no matter how minimal, that will reflect the weight of the aggression or be a reward to the aggressor.

This is Syria's firm stand based on the principles of international legitimacy and the UN resolutions. This stand mandates Israel's withdrawal from every inch of the occupied Syrian Golan, the West Bank, Jerusalem, the Gaza Strip, and southern Lebanon. It also mandates securing the Palestinian people's legitimate national and political rights, foremost being their right to self-determination.

The establishment of settlements in the occupied Arab territories is an illegal act and is considered null and void. It is a major obstacle on the road to peace. This dictates their elimination. The continued settlement activity in the occupied Arab territories after the peace process has started is tangible proof that Israel does not want to attain real peace.

Mr. President: Syria's acceptance of President Bush's initiative, which is based on Resolutions 242 and 338 and the land- for-peace principle, has opened the door, as everyone acknowledges, to the peace process.

Our participation in this conference embodies our desire to achieve a just and comprehensive peace. Our acceptance of holding bilateral talks is also a clear indication of our serious contribution toward the establishment of a real, comprehensive peace in the region.

Our eagerness to make the peace process succeed, however, requires that multilateral talks—which are not in the context of Resolution 242—not begin except after gaining a substantial, concrete achievement in bilateral talks that confirms the removal of the major obstacles to peace. This is because Israel, as everyone knows, is not concerned with implementing Resolutions 242 and 338 on the basis of land for peace, but is concerned only with engaging itself, along with the region's states, in negotiations on regional cooperation while continuing to consolidate its occupation of Arab territories. This contradicts the objective on whose basis this conference has been convened.

Mr. President: We have come for a just and honorable peace that rests on right and international legitimacy, not for a fake peace that reflects the conditions of the aggressor and the weight of the occupation. We have come for a real peace that includes all the fronts of the Arab-Israeli conflict, not for a peace that deals with one aspect of the conflict and creates new conflicts and tensions in the region.

Out of our belief in this peace, we announce, with confidence and determination, our resolve to work for a peaceful, just, and comprehensive settlement to the Arab-Israeli conflict that liberates territory and ensures the national rights of the Palestinian people and security for all.

If the peace conference succeeds in achieving these objectives, which the entire world looks forward to achieving, this will herald a new dawn in our turbulent region and an era of peace and prosperity and stability.

Peace be upon you.

Arab Delegations React to Shamir 31 Oct Speech

'Ashrawi, al-Husayni

JN3110152591 Amman Jordan Television Network in English 1300 GMT 31 Oct 91

[News conference by Dr. Hanan 'Ashrawi, Palestinian spokesperson; and Faysal al-Husayni, head of the Palestinian delegation advisory council, in Madrid on 31 October—recorded; monitored in progress]

[Text] ...negotiations would be happy to talk to you and our Palestinian spokesperson, Dr. Hanan 'Ashrawi, would brief you on the activities of today in the conference. Please.

[Faysal al-Husayni in Arabic fading into English translation] In fact, I would like to comment today on Mr. Shamir's speech. Two days ago, Mr. Shamir made remarks which we thought were very positive, and we thought that we really were on the road to peace. We thought that this was a first step, and after having heard Mr. Shamir today, we saw unfortunately that the tone of what he was saying of the Israeli position makes us lose ground and go even further back, and we have certain doubts with regard to the real Israeli position. In any case, we hope that these stands will not be the permanent stands, and we certainly trust that in the future, Israel will aspire to peace in a spirit of what was mentioned two days ago and not what was said this morning. Thank you.

[Hanan 'Ashrawi] Good evening, or good afternoon. I would like to brief you on the meeting that took place between the guidance committee of the Palestinian team yesterday evening with Secretary Baker. We had a very constructive and positive meeting with Secretary Baker in which we reviewed the progress of Palestinian-American talks and efforts during this process. We also discussed the opening of the conference and the speeches, and we discussed briefly the prospects of future talks in the bilaterals and the multilaterals.

This evening, the guidance committee will also have a meeting with Mr. Van Den Broek from the European Community. Our response to President [as heard] Shamir's statement is one of tremendous dismay. We had hoped that Mr. Shamir will come to this conference with a new attitude, recognizing the needs of the moment, trying to assert the humanity of the other, rather than negate the legitimacy of the other, using a type of language, a discourse that is new that would reach out in order to establish peace. We felt that the content was hardlined. He brought nothing new. It was a reiteration of the same old entrenched positions. He did not try in any way to modify or recognize the needs of a peace conference. He tried to negate our history and we are extremely resentful of the fact that there is a clear distortion of our history.

Actually, in essence what he did was he brought to this conference the attitude and the tone of the occupier, and we have been victims of domination and racism and distortion as people under occupation. The tone of that speech reflected exactly what was happening in the occupied territories: domination, racism, and a patronizing attitude. He did not make a single conciliatory gesture to the Palestinians. On the contrary, he came out and told us what we had to do in the same way as he came out and told the Arabs what they had to do. He did not, in any way, address himself and his people on what they had to do. I don't think that Mr. Shamir knows best what's good for everybody. We also felt that he negated in many ways a voice of a large minority, if not half of Israel, people who have been working with us, people who have expressed to us directly an intense commitment to peace. These are the Israelis who for many years have presented the civil and civilized face of Israel, the human face of Israel to Palestinians, who have reached out to us not just in words but also in action. Some of them—admittedly a small minority, but we recognize that minority—reached out to us in times of pain, of death, of imprisonment, of house demolitions. They demonstrated with us. They tried to prevent deportations. They tried to prevent demolitions, and these people were not recognized. Their tone, their atitude was absent from the speech. It reflects the attitude and tone of an occupier of a brutalizing authority and of the extreme right-wing position in his government, and he was trying, actually, to use this conference in order to legitimize the occupation and negate not just our history but our national identity. He did not recognize a new national identity in his speech.

In our speech, we will not respond. We will not adopt the same attitude. I think the time has come to assert our humanity and the humanity of the other. The speech was provocative and we refuse to be provoked, to do the same to the others. This has constantly been the history of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict where attempts at dehumanizing the Palestinians have persisted, especially in the myth of the nonexistent people, the land without a people that has been debunked very clearly. We are here in front of you, Palestinians; and I think, and we have not at any point reciprocated in the same way. We refuse to dehumanize the enemy, and I had hoped that he would rise to the level of acknowledging the humanity of the adversary because without that we are not going to get anywhere.

[Mirvat Rajab from Egyptian television in Arabic fading into English translation] Why did you say that the meeting with Baker was positive? What has the Palestinian people achieved up till now?

['Ashrawi in Arabic fading into English translation] The positive aspects of our meeting with Baker was as a result of the contacts over the recent months and following the review of the letter of guarantees and the assurances and Mr. Bush's attitude and of U.S. policy in general, and also because they have dealt with future steps—and I'm not going to say anything further on that. But with regard to the achievements, I can summarize this without going into detail. The Palestinian national identity exits clearly, and it is clearly expressed in this conference. And this is an international recognition of it.

[Unidentified reporter] [words indistinct] Mr. Shamir by making a statement two days ago. Would you [word indistinct] the Palestinian delegation that it was positive somehow—as offering some hope, and now he is coming with closing all venues and avenues toward negotiating and talking with the Palestinians. Is this a speech which was directed to the Israeli electorates, who because he is in trouble with his foreign minister, or what do you make of this speech which really closed everthing?

['Ashrawi] I will not talk about motives. I don't know his intentions, and I don't claim to read them. But I tell you we responded positively to a very small hint that the land may be negotiable, and we thought that probably he was sending a hint that there is a new tone emerging from the hardline Israeli side. Unfortunately, the speech today totally belied that. I will not discuss why or how. I do understand that there are domestic problems in the Israeli political arena. Actually, it was evident by the exclusion of Foreign Minister Levi and the fact that Shamir chose to come here himself means that he wanted to deliver the most hardline speech possible in order to indicate that Israel has not budged one inch literally and metaphorically. On the contrary, we are meeting with a backdrop of a new settlement in the occupied territories.

[Unidentified member of the Palestinian media team, in Arabic fading into English translation] How do you interpret the procedures of the Israelis in the occupied territories while there are now peace talks going on, and how do you interpret what is happening and the killings that are happening at the present time in the occupied territories?

[Al-Husayni in Arabic fading into English translation] In reality the Israeli attitude shows that Israel is insisting on blocking the way to peace. This was expressed by events yesterday and the announcement of new settlements. We are still hoping, we are still counting on what we can offer in favor of peace, and we know despite the fact that the Israeli Government may continue to be inflexible, but we know that this may endanger the whole peace process.

We hope, we intend to continue the struggle, however, and there may be a clear international position. We hope to see the position of the Israeli people that may rescue this conference from failure.

[Reporter from Soviet television in English fading into Arabic translation] [passage indistinct]

[Al-Husayni in Arabic fading into English translation] In reality, we the Palestinians have already presented a position with regard to our willingess to arrive at a solution after what was presented in 1988, and through our presence here in this conference. We have also made concessions with regard to procedural matters, and now it is up to Israel to show their good intentions, their goodwill to achieve peace. And we have to get what we need in this area. I believe the start will be here in Madrid two days or one and a half days after the opening of this conference....

['Ashrawi, interrupting] The bilaterals will start the fourth day after the convening of the conference. It depends on what the fourth day is, so it will be either Saturday or Sunday, because the fourth day is Saturday as agreed upon. I wanted to respond to Mr. Shamir's invitations for the bilaterals to be in Israel and the Arab countries. The Palestinian position very clearly is that there can be no bilateral negotiations in Israel—not so long as Israel is occupying Palestinian and Arab territories. We cannot negotiate under duress. We will not subject our team to measures of curfew, detention, censorship, imprisonment, deportation, and then tell them you have to negotiate with your occupier. We need a neutral and free place, in which we are able to move freely, in which our security is guaranteed, and we are not negotiating with the severe handicap of the Israeli occupation constantly dictating its terms, physically, politically, and in every other way.

[Unidenitified reporter] Does that also include East Jerusalem? Would you be willing to go to East Jerusalem?

['Ashrawi] We are willing to negotiate on any territory—Palestinian territory which is free, and where we will negotiate as equals. If they are willing to withdraw from the occupied territories and East Jerusalem, then we will go where we will negotiate freely.

[Unidentified reporter in Arabic fading into English translation] In his address, the Israeli prime minister denied three things: the existence of the Palestinian people, the existence of legitimacy, and the existence of occupied territories. While he spoke about those things, does it mean that he is blocking the process to the second round of negotiations? My other question is that Shamir said, among other things, that to emphasize the aspect of land might be an obstacle before peace. This means that the Palestinian side wants to postpone this aspect.

[Al-Husayni in Arabic fading into English translation] With regard to the first question, it is clear that Mr. Shamir wants to establish preconditions and positions that are premature. He is still talking about the future. He is ignoring our own existence, and the existence of the Palestinian delegation at the negotiating table. He is ignoring the environment created by the peace conference. Unfortunately, he was talking about the past, and he is still living in the past, and in this way we cannot go forward in the peace process. We are sure that in order to continue forward in this process, there has to be a different spirit on the part of Mr. Shamir. We are not only speaking here of a simple and mere peace process. We have not come here to score points one against the other but to build peace, and Shamir's style and tone is not appropriate.

[Unidentified reporter] I am trying to find out, Ms. 'Ashrawi, in your meeting with Secretary Baker, did he mention to you or suggest to you that in the presentations that you do not mention the PLO or speak about the PLO in any way? Can you tell me, please?

['Ashrawi] Let me make this very clear. Nobody has the right to censor or dictate the Palestinian utterance. I think this is what the real intifadah is all about. We have the right to speak out for ourselves, and we have the right to assert our own legitimacy, and I think Mr. Baker is sensitive to that.

[Unidentified reporter] [passage indistinct]

['Ashrawi] No, no, he did not ask us not to mention things or to do things.

[Unidentified reporter] This is a newspaper from Spain. I would like to ask you, Mrs. 'Ashrawi, about what compensation, what kind of compensation from the economic point of view, what we get from Israel if you get back the occupied territories?

['Ashrawi] I am sorry, I don't understand who will get what compensation?

[Reporter] If you get back the occupied territories from Israel, what economical compensation would you have?

['Ashrawi] I think, I tell you very frankly that the bill is very big and very long. There has been an outstanding bill since 1948, and I think that the compensation is not just economic. There is the displacement of people. There is the dispersion of the Palestinians. There is the destruction of our infrastructure. There are the taxes and fines which were outright theft. There were also (?such things) in addition to confiscations and (?so on) to be looked at. I think we have seen from the European Community a willingness to reach out to the Palestinians and to help them develop, to help us develop our own independent economy, and we recognize that.

We have the last question please.

[Unidentified reporter, in Arabic] Mr. Faysal...

[Unidentified reporter, interrupting in English] [words indistinct] has begun to develop in the next venue for the negotiations between the Arab delegations and the State of Israel. It is clear that Mr. Binyamin Netanyahu feels that psychologically, it would be best for the Arabs to go to Jerusalem and for the Israelis to come to Damascus. Our question is simple. In view of the seven months of work by Secretary of State James Baker to get the Arab delegations as well as the Israeli delegation to Spain, what is the position of the Palestinian delegation in considering this to be Madrid One and having Madrid Two, Madrid Three, as long as it takes to continue on the future agenda of the issues that really are at stake here. Would you be willing to return to Madrid, and consider Madrid to be the place that has been found after 500 years after the Arabs and Jews left from Spain. Here we are again trying to sort out our problems?

['Ashrawi] The symbolic significance of Madrid has not been lost on anybody, and Madrid has been extremely hospitable to us. We have no objections. On the contrary, we would like to carry out negotiations in Madrid. The important issue is that when you have two adversaries negotiating, you need to be on neutral territory without undue pressure or duress on either side, without all the emotional as well as the political conditions that might influence one side or the other.

To us, as Palestinians, it is imperative that we not be subject to occupation when we negotiate. We want neutral territory where we can move freely, where we can be treated as equals, and we have been able here to be treated as equals, to speak out freely....

[Unidentified speaker, interrupting] We have consumed the time, but I just like to remind you that by 1500 we will have [words indistinct].

More 'Ashrawi Remarks

JN3110213291 Amman Jordan Television Network in Arabic 1800 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Interview with Dr. Hanan 'Ashrawi, spokeswoman for the Palestinian side of the joint Jordanian-Palestinian delegation to the Madrid peace conference, by Kassab Samawi on 31 October in Madrid—recorded]

[Text] [Samawi] Dr. Hanan, the people in the occupied land were watching with us the historic speech delivered by the chief Palestinian delegate to the peace conference. What were the points the speech sought to highlight?

['Ashrawi] To begin with, that was the speech of the Palestinian people and of Palestinian justice. It is the address of the Palestinians under occupation and in the diaspora. It is a cry from the heart and a program from the mind. It is a bold, frank, sincere, and honest posture. The address spoke on their behalf. We hear with their ears and see with their eyes. It is a historic moment in the history of the Palestinian people who, through this international forum, are addressing themselves to the whole world and to the human conscience, the human mind, and human law. The Palestinians challenge them all to apply honestly and sincerely these laws, norms, and morality to the Palestinian people's case.

[Samawi] You heard the speech of the Israeli prime minister. Did it surprise you?

['Ashrawi] Whoever has lived under occupation and has had to endure its practices and policies can hardly be surprised by what the Israelis do. Mr. Shamir's speech reflects a customary, clear, hard-line, nervous posture. It is an expression of what they do on the ground in Palestine and of their practices against the Palestinian people. Shamir has brought along to the peace conference halls in Madrid all the arrogance and racism of occupation. His speech has shown what occupation is all about.

[Samawi] Do you expect that Shamir will maintain his hard line at the bilateral negotiations?

['Ashrawi] It depends on practice—whether it was a dramatic gesture meant for hard-liners in Israel, or whether it was meant to lay the groundwork for the peace process from the standpoint of the Israelis. However, I think that more than half the Israeli people oppose this trend and reject this speech and tone. He spoke for the hard-liners, but not in the name of all of the Israeli people. We know that there are major forces in Israel and that a major section of the Israeli population rejects this logic or nonlogic. The Israeli public also knows that attempts to cancel out the enemy and to suppress the Palestinian identity are a desparate exercise. There can be no peace except with a Palestinian people enjoying all national rights, based on equality. We are addressing the world on an equal footing with others with self-confidence and pride, for all the suffering. We are a people living under occupation, but we are far from defeated.

Al-Shar' on 'Trite' Shamir Speech

JN3110161891 Damascus Syrian Arab Republic Radio Network in Arabic 1215 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Radio team report from Madrid]

[Text] Foreign Minister Faruq al-Shar' has asserted that there will not be any separation between the Madrid conference and bilateral discussions. Speaking to reporters here, al-Shar' said: We have come on the basis that the conference is held in Madrid and will be followed by bilateral talks. We did not have any discussions with the United States to the effect that the peace process will be divided. Also, there was no idea about separating the conference and the bilateral talks. He added: The mutual understanding during talks with the United States was that the peace process, from beginning to end, would be held at an agreed-upon venue, and an agreement was made on Madrid. On this basis, and in all the discussions with the United States, the focus was on setting one venue for the peace process. Therefore, the Arab parties taking part in this conference believe that the bilateral talks, from A to Z, should continue in Madrid.

Responding to a question about what lies behind Israel's insistence on transferring the venue of the talks, al-Shar' said: Israel's objective is to evade the peace process and create pretexts pertaining to formalities and procedures in order to destroy the peace process.

Asked what would happen if Israel insisted on changing the venue of the negotiations, al-Shar' said: We believe that if Israel insists on this, after an agreement had been reached that the peace process will continue in Madrid, then this is considered a new Israeli condition that cannot be accepted; this means that Israel wants to withdraw from the conference and is maneuvering to find a pretext to blow up the peace process.

Asked about his initial reaction to Shamir's speech, he said Shamir's speech greatly falsifies facts and history and attempts to evade the basis on which the conference is being held. We have noticed that Shamir has avoided reference to Resolutions 242 and 338 and the land-for-peace principle, which are the two bases on which the conference is being held.

Al-Shar' added that Shamir's speech is trite and repeats previous Israeli pretexts in order to justify the continuation of Israel's occupation of Arab territory and its disregard for the national rights of the Palestinian people. In his speech, Shamir also speaks about peace without restoration of territories; this is an impossible peace. This also proves that Israel did not come to the conference with the intention of one who wants to achieve a just, real peace.

Jordanian—Shamir Speech 'Hardline'

JN3110192391 Amman Jordan Television Network in Arabic 1800 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Interview with Dr. Marwan al-Mu'ashshir, spokesman for the Jordanian side in the joint Jordanian-Palestinian delegation to the peace conference, by Kassab Samawi on 31 October in Madrid—recorded]

[Text] [Samawi] How does Jordan's speech to the conference compare with the Israeli address?

[Al-Mu'ashshir] Israel's address was extremely hard-line, with Shamir offering a distorted interpretation of history lacking any clear vision of the future. We do not view the conference as an occasion to talk about the past, but rather a forum from which to look to the future and a fair and comprehensive peace in the region. The speech was extremely negative, and has been thus viewed even by the press here. As for Jordan's address, it was positive and moderate and opened up fresh vistas for cooperation and a fair settlement rooted in international legitimacy.

[Samawi] Shamir's address today renewed the call for bilateral talks to be held in the Middle East. How do you react?

[Mu'ashshir] Jordan prefers the negotiations to be conducted in Madrid. It is still too early for these talks to be held in the Middle East. In any case, the date for these talks should be decided upon in the coming few days.

[Samawi] Do you expect to see a shift in Shamir's position at the conference table?

[Mu'ashshir] We hope to see an Israeli posture different from the one we saw this morning because, even though it is not possible to judge the peace process by just one speech—it being a long and arduous process not to be judged by a speech here and a remark there—Shamir's speech hardly offers an encouraging gesture to get the negotiations going. We hope to see a diverse Israeli position.

Musa—Shamir 'Did Not Block' Peace Road

JN3110174491 Amman Radio Jordan Network in Arabic 1302 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Telephone interview with Egyptian Foreign Minister 'Amr Musa in Madrid on 31 October by Khalil al-Qaryuti in Amman—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Al-Qaryuti] What is your comment on the speech delivered by Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhaq Shamir at today's session?

[Musa] We listened to it attentively in order to explore the prospects for action in the course of the conference and negotiations. In any case, the speech was not as intransigent as some had expected. Some had also perhaps expected that he would block the negotiations. In other words, he did not block the road of prospects for making headway. [passage omitted]

[Al-Qaryuti] Mr. Minister, were the venue and date for the [bilateral] negotiations discussed?

[Musa] This is the topic of current talks and consultations. The talks will certainly begin in Madrid within the next few days.

[Al-Qaryuti] Thank you, Mr. 'Amr Musa, Egyptian foreign minister.

[Musa] Thank you.

Israelis React to Arab Delegations' Speeches

Shamir 'Angry and Furious'

TA3110212591 Tel Aviv IDF Radio in Hebrew 2015 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Report by political correspondent Natan Gutman from Madrid]

[Text] Unlike yesterday, Shamir today seemed angry and furious about what he heard at the conference. He used very strong terms about the Syrian and Palestinian speeches today. Let us first hear a short interview the prime minister granted to Qol Yisra'el and IDF Radio.

[Begin recording] [Shamir] I would not say things were very surprising, but they could have been different. We should learn from what took place today and carry on. The conference—the ceremonial part of the process—is coming to an end tomorrow. Now, as agreed upon, we should move to the bilateral negotiations. The question currently on the agenda is how and where these negotiations will take place.

[Gutman] Mr. Shamir, in light of the Syrian and Palestinian speeches you heard at the conference today, do you think there is a common basis at all for the opening of bilateral negotiations?

[Shamir] I did not expect the speeches to serve as a basis for the negotiations. According to these speeches, there is nothing to speak about—except for our speech. [laughs] We will still try to conduct bilateral negotiations.

[Unidentified correspondent] The Palestinians speak of an expectation for steps that will improve their living standards. Will you consider such a possibility in order to create perhaps a sort of a momentum....

[Shamir, interrupting] When negotiations begin they can suggest anything, just as we will, and we will discuss each issue in an orderly manner and make decisions accordingly.

[Qol Yisra'el political correspondent Arye Golan] Sir, what is your reaction to the speech by Syrian Foreign Minister Faruq al- Shar'?

[Shamir] It was a very extreme and shallow speech, and I would not like to elaborate any further.

[Golan] Did the Palestinian speech sound more moderate to you?

[Shamir] God forbid. It was not moderate. It was extreme, but designed to influence public opinion. That feature was missing from the Syrian speech.

[Gutman] Mr. Shamir, the bilateral negotiations begin on Sunday with a discussion of the venue. If an arrangement about the venue is not reached, will this mark the end of the process?

[Shamir] Definitely not, definitely not. Solutions will have to be found. We have good proposals for a solution.

[Unidentified correspondent] What is the position of Egypt on the venue of the bilateral talks? Is it playing a positive role?
[Shamir] I do not know what Egypt's position is. The Egyptian representatives say they are trying to help promote this process. I do not know whether they are doing so or not.

[Golan] Mr. Prime Minister, tomorrow, before you travel to Jerusalem to light the Sabbath candles, you will have 15 minutes for a rebuttal. What will you tell the Syrians, the Palestinians, and the others?
[Shamir] We are writing that now. [laughs]

[Gutman] Mr. Shamir, do you regret having come here to the conference?
[Shamir] God forbid. I do not regret this. I think this was a correct move. I think we have thus expressed the government's policy to do everything possible for peace, while defending Israel's vital interests. [end recording]

Let me add to what Shamir said in his briefing to correspondents today. About the Syrian speech, Shamir said it was a waste of time to consider it, as it was a collection of impudent lies that cannot pass any examination. It has been a long time since we heard such shallow, false, and ridiculous remarks. I am not surprised, Shamir stated, but I still thought that on such an occasion, talk would be on a different level. Faruq al-Shar' was loyal to himself and to those who sent him, though.

On the speech by Haydar 'Abd-al-Shafi, Shamir said: This is a propaganda speech that could be easily discounted. It appealed to the audience's feelings of compassion for the underdog [last word in English], for people who are suffering. It did not, however, examine the problem in depth; it did not say who started this war and why this suffering began. He did not speak about the historic connection between the Palestinian people and Eretz Yisra'el; he did not say a single word as to why we occupied this land; he did not mention dates, nor speak of any historic eras, or the future, or anything. We will answer him tomorrow. His speech was meant for propaganda and was based on falsities.

In this context, Shamir mentioned the Americans, saying: The Americans had prepared us for moderate speeches. They asked the sides to deliver moderate speeches. They said that the delegations agree to a two-stage process and do not want to liquidate Israel, but we did not see this. The speeches were extreme anti-Israeli speeches, leaving no opening for anything other than a full surrender by Israel.

Does this mean an end of the process, we asked the prime minister. His answer: We did not pin hopes on these speeches. We knew they would be radical, and we are not taking it too hard.

As for the direct negotiations, the prime minister said: We should try. We are not risking anything, nor promising anything—no concessions—in advance.

Additional details about the bilateral talks: They will begin on Sunday apparently. There are still disagreements about the terms and venue of the negotiations. Israel still firmly insists that they take place in the region, and Shamir said today: I told Baker in Israel that we are prepared to compromise on having the initial talks on the venue in Madrid, on having a single meeting in Madrid, so that it would not be said that the negotiations did not begin. At any rate, Shamir said, we did the best we could to help promote the process. One should not give up hope. We should try, as long as we do not undertake to give what we do not want to give or cannot give.

In sum then, as far as Israel is concerned, this was not a satisfactory day. It featured strong and radical speeches, and there is as yet no progress on the venue of the bilateral talks. Tomorrow, Shamir will deliver a rebuttal to the speeches he heard here and then will rush to fly back home, together with many from his entourage. The officials remaining here will hold a single round of talks on Sunday, in which they will discuss the venue.

[Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in Hebrew at 2015 GMT on 31 October also reports on Shamir's remarks: "Asked whether the Palestinians in their speech crossed our red lines on the PLO issue, Shamir said: They took care not to do so. They refrained from doing so. They were warned not to cross the lines on the link that the Palestinian delegation has with the PLO, so that Israel would not quit the conference." The report goes on: "Asked whether tomorrow he will rebut the claims he heard during the speeches of the Arab representatives today, Shamir said: More or less. I do not know whether I will cover every detail. I have only 15 minutes at my disposal." Asked whether the Madrid ceremonial part will end without handshakes, without exchanges of looks, Shamir responded: "We exchange looks all the time; it is impossible not to do so. There is no agreement on other things, however, such as handshakes and embraces." Shamir continues: "This is only the first step of a long process. If we had reached the end of the process, such a question would be in place." Asked whether he will shake hands or embrace with Hafiz al-Asad in the future, Shamir replied: "Look, every beginning is hard. A handshake does not interest me. The content of the agreement that will be signed and implemented is what interests me."]

More on al-Shar' Address

TA3110175691 Tel Aviv IDF Radio in Hebrew 1700 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Report by political correspondent Natan Gutman—live]

[Text] The prime minister and the other members of the Israeli delegation have just returned from Palacio Real, where they heard the stern speech of Syrian Foreign

Minister Faruq al-Shar'. All the reactions in the Israeli delegation were very harsh. Let us hear a brief comment by Prime Minister Shamir:

[Begin recording] [Shamir] You know, several days ago I said that the conference would not be a bed of roses, but today it was all a thorn garden.

[Unidentified correspondent] Do you regret coming here?
[Shamir] I do not regret anything. It is ending. [laughs]

[Qol Yisra'el's political correspondent Arye Golan] Can we make peace with people like al-Shar'?
[Shamir] This is really the question.

[Golan] What is your reply, sir?
[Shamir] We have to keep trying, nevertheless. [end recording]

Those were the prime minister's remarks. We heard another member of the delegation as well—Likud Knesset Member 'Uzi Landau. He also used harsh terms to describe the al-Shar' speech:

[Begin recording] [Landau] I believe that when the Americans realize what is behind those remarks—and it is not someone who came to negotiate—they will convince the Syrians to take the necessary steps to see the negotiations succeed.

[Gutman] Is there a point in holding direct negotiations with the Syrians at present?
[Landau] Israel should hold direct negotiations with anyone, with no preconditions. We will sit with whoever accepts those terms. He who does not will be excluding himself from the talks.

[Gutman] Were you surprised or disappointed by the Syrian speech?
[Landau] I was not surprised, but I was a little disappointed. We came with a belief that some change has occurred in the basic Arab stand, at least the Syrian, and found none. [end recording]

Al-Shar's 'Goebbels-Style' Speech

TA3110190691 Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in Hebrew 1712 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Interview with Zalman Shoval, Israeli ambassador to Washington, by Arye Golan in Madrid—live]

[Text] [Golan] Mr. Shoval, were you disappointed by the speech by Syrian Foreign Minister Faruq al-Shar'?

[Shoval] I was not surprised, but I am disappointed in general with the tone of a large part of the Arab speeches. We had hoped that maybe something had changed on the other side. Our hopes, however, have been dashed. The speech by al-Shar' was a classic Goebbels-style speech, a mishmash of lies and half-truths. He spoke and incited against the Jewish media. That subject was also very popular with the Nazi regime. He spoke about 500,000 refugees from the Golan Heights, but we know that 500,000 Arabs or Druze never lived on the Golan Heights. At the most there were between 100,000 and 120,000 people. By the way, al-Qunaytirah is in their hands, so why do they not return the refugees there? He spoke about the Jews' good fortune in the Arab countries, saying they had never lived better than in the Arab world. Of course, he forgot about the 4,000 Syrian Jews imprisoned in Syria. As for the Palestinian speech that....

[Golan, interrupting] Perhaps we will get to that later, but please let me ask one more question. You said it was a very tough speech, a classical Goebbels speech, which recalled the Nazi propaganda effort. But perhaps what really counts, Mr. Ambassador, is the fact that, although there is a lot of tough talk, we are sitting down at the same table with Syria?

[Shoval] We are sitting down at the same table with Syria, and we are happy to sit down with any Arab delegation in order to negotiate peace. Al-Shar's remarks, however, were so repulsive in their rejection of peace, in their rejection of every compromise, in their rejection of the very spirit of compromise, that it is very difficult to remain optimistic about the chances of achieving peace with the Syrians.

[Golan] Would it be correct to say you found it easier to listen to Dr. Haydar 'Abd-al-Shafi, the head of the Palestinian delegation, than Faruq al-Shar'?

[Shoval] I am not sure that I would say that, because I think the Syrian speech was so extreme that it is actually impossible to take it seriously. I do not believe that anyone in the enlightened world could take it seriously. Incidentally, he has also actually attacked Egypt for making peace with Israel. The Palestinian speech was far more elegant in its phrasing, but its contents were difficult and tough. He mentioned the various UN resolutions that, if interpreted and understood in one way, could have led to the destruction of the State of Israel, God forbid; they mentioned the right of return and similar things. In short, the packaging was much softer and pleasing to the ear, but the contents were not necessarily so.

[Golan] Is there still hope?

[Shoval] Look, there is always hope, and as the prime minister said earlier, it is not the speeches, but the desire to hold negotiations, that will decide things. The United States has an imporant role to play in this regard. It has to explain to the Arab world that to win U.S. backing for those issues on which they need U.S. support, they must reach peace with Israel.

[Golan] Thank you, Ambassador Shoval.

'Hostile' Palestinian Speech

TA3110154191 Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in Hebrew 1432 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Interview with Zalman Shoval, Israeli ambassador to Washington, by Tzvi Lidar in Jerusalem and Arye Golan and Yig'al Rom in Madrid—live]

[Text] [Lidar] Mr. Shoval, are you with us?

[Shoval] I am on the line.

[Lidar] Well, you just heard the speech by the Palestinian representative. What is your initial reaction?

[Shoval] I can give you an initial reaction, and it will be the same later. It was a hostile and uncompromising speech under an elegant silk cover. His real message was a refusal to recognize our rights. It was actually a call for dismantling the State of Israel because he based his speech on ancient UN resolutions, referring to the 1947 partition plan, to the right of return for the refugees, and other issues. He perverted history and ignored the developments of recent years when he spoke of the aid and assistance the Palestinians received over the years from the Arab states. Of course, we all smiled upon hearing those statements. The word intifadah was uttered more often than the word peace. We did not hear the kind of real and sincere desire that was evident today in Prime Minister Shamir's speech when he called on the Arab parties to establish a true peace, to visit us as we visit them, and to talk peace.

[Rom] Did Haydar 'Abd-al-Shafi's speech contain any preconditions, such as the call to withdraw from the territories as a condition for bilateral talks, or the demand to halt settlements?

[Shoval] There certainly were, and he even raised another condition when he said that the multilateral talks must be conditional on Israel's acceptance of the preconditions he raised.

[Golan] We spoke about the climate that must be created by this conference in order to move on to the later stages—the bilateral negotiations. Do you think the speech by the Palestinian representative contributed to such an atmosphere?

[Shoval] No, I do not think so. I think his contribution was negative and not what is needed here. Judging by those statements, the Palestinian delegates have still not learned the lessons of their own history and do not understand the new reality in the Middle East.

[Lidar] Mr. Shoval, did you also feel that the statements were not really directed at the Israeli delegation at the palace but rather an attempt to appeal to a larger audience, perhaps the Israeli public?

[Shoval] Undoubtedly. The seemingly elegant cover I mentioned before also intended to appeal to U.S. and European public opinion, and to what is referred to as the Arab street. You cannot, however, pile one falsification on top of another without the truth revealing itself.

[Rom] Did the use of the word PLO during the speech comply with the agreements reached prior to the conference?

[Shoval] I do not know. We will have to read the exact text of the expression.

[Rom] At any rate, you were not encouraged by the speech?

[Shoval] No, definitely not. We came here with an open heart to sit down with our Arab neighbors from all the countries and with the Palestinian Arabs from the territories and to try to find some arrangement, but we are now witnessing something completely different.

[Lidar] Could the Palestinian representative's signal about the possibility of a Jordanian-Palestinian confederation offer Israel some sort of opening for a new initiative?

[Shoval] No, because that is not a new formula at all. That formula has existed for many years.

[Lidar] Then this is actually turning back the clock.

[Shoval] That is right. A confederation of the type that could be set up, could also come apart due to what I would call an independent and sovereign decision by either of the two components in the federation. That would actually be letting the Palestinian state in through the back door.

[Lidar] Well, that is quite discouraging. Incidentally, are you are talking with us from the palace?

[Shoval] I am speaking with you from the palace a few minutes after the end of the Palestinian representative's speech. Let us conclude the conversation on an optimistic note and mention that the future of peace does not depend on any particular speech made here.

[Lidar] What about the prime minister's response? We only saw his lips moving but could not hear what he said. Did you hear anything?

[Shoval] Yes.

[Lidar] Did the prime minister issue any reaction?

[Shoval] No, the prime minister will react in his closing statements tomorrow before he departs for Israel. He is leaving early, as you already know.

[Rom] He will not wait until the end of the session?

[Shoval] No, he cannot, because he has to return before the beginning of the Sabbath.

[Lidar] Thank you very much, Mr. Shoval.

Participants Deliver Closing Addresses

Shamir

TA0111081991 Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in Hebrew 0710 GMT 1 Nov 91

[Address by Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhaq Shamir to the Middle East peace conference at Madrid's Palacio Real—live, in English]

[Text] Distinguished Cochairmen, Ladies, and Gentlemen: Let me first apologize as I have to leave this hall immediately after my statement, together with some of my colleagues, in order to return to Israel before sunset, in time for the advent of our holy day of rest. I trust no one will see in this a sign of disrespect.

Let me also express again our thanks and appreciation to our Spanish hosts and to the cosponsors for putting so much effort in making this conference possible.

For two days, we have sat in this hall, armed with a lot of patience, to listen to what our Arab neighbors have to say. We have heard much criticism and many charges. We can respond to each and every charge, to every misrepresentation of history and fact—and there were quite a few—and we can refute every contention. We, too, can cite morality, justice, and international legality in our favor. But is this what we have come here for? Such futile exchanges and rebuttals have been taking place for the last 43 years at the United Nations and in countless international gatherings. They have not brought us one inch closer to mutual understanding and peace. This is precisely why we have persistently called for direct face-to-face talks. Nevertheless, we came here out of goodwill, hoping there might be change, a turn for the better in tone and content that would lead us to a new and more promising chapter, and we have not given up this hope.

Let me, therefore, make just a few remarks—not for the sake of polemics, but to shed light on a few facts. Syria's representative wants us and the world to believe that this country is a model of freedom and protection of human rights, including those of the Jews. Such a statement stretches incredulity to infinite proportions. The ancient Jewish community in Syria has been exposed to cruel expression, torture, and discrimination of the worst kind. Most of the Jews fled the country over the years, and the few thousands left are living in perpetual terror. Anyone who tries to cross the border is incarcerated in prison, beaten and tortured, and his family exposed to punishment and constant fear.

But not only are the Jews the victims of the Syrian regime. To this day, Syria is the home of a host of terrorist organizations that spread violence and death to all kinds of innocent targets, including civil aviation and women and children of many nations. I could go on and recite a litany of facts that demonstrate the extent to which Syria merits the dubious honor of being one of the most oppressive, tyrannical regimes in the world, but this is not what we have come here for.

To the Lebanese people, our neighbors to the north, we send a message of sympathy and understanding. They are suffering under the yoke of Syrian occupation and oppression and are denied even the capacity to cry out in protest. We bear no ill will to the courageous and suffering Lebanese, and we join them in the hope that they will soon regain their independence and freedom. We have no designs on Lebanese territory, and in the context of a peace treaty and the removal of the Syrian presence, we can restore stability and security on the borders between our two countries.

In many respects, we have a situation of de facto nonbelligerency with the Kingdom of Jordan. We sincerely believe that a peace treaty with Jordan is achievable. In the context of such a treaty, we will determine together the secure and recognized boundaries and lay the foundation for a relationship of mutual cooperation and neighborly relations. Both countries stand to gain from a relationship of peace, and we hope to achieve it through direct, bilateral negotiations.

I listened attentively to the statement of the Palestinian Arab spokesman in the joint Jordanian-Palestinian delegation. The Palestinian Arabs are our closest neighbors and in many respects their lives are intertwined with ours. This is one more reason for the importance we attach to an accommodation with this community. The Palestinian Arab spokesman made a valiant effort at recounting the sufferings of his people. But let me say that listing history and perversion of facts will not earn them the sympathy which they strive to acquire. Was it not Palestinians who slaughtered a major part of the Jewish community of Hebron without any provocation? Was it not Palestinians who rejected every peace proposal since the beginning of the century and responded by violence? Was it not Palestinians who produced a leader who collaborated with the Nazis in the extermination of Jews during the Holocaust? Was it not the Palestinians who called their Arab brethren in 1948 to come and help them destroy the Jewish state? Was it not the Palestinians who rejoiced and danced on the roofs when Iraqi Scud missiles were falling on Tel Aviv? Have they forgotten that more Palestinians were killed by their own brethren in a few recent years than in clashes with Israeli security forces? Even to this very day, under conditions which you describe as occupation, is it not a fact that any Jew who strays into an Arab village risks his life, but tens of thousands of Palestinian Arabs work freely in every town and village in Israel and no one molests them?

We have presented the Palestinians a fair proposal, one that offers them a chance to improve their lot immensely. I appeal to them to accept our proposal and join us in negotiations.

Ladies and gentlemen, we have come here to seek together the road that would lead us to peace and accommodation rather [than] to engage in a match of charges and countercharges. Peace is not just words or a signature on a piece of paper. Peace is a frame of mind and a set of actions that are the opposite of hostility and create a climate of mutual trust, tolerance, and respect.

With an open heart, we call on the Arab leaders to take the courageous step and respond to our outstretched hand in peace. Yesterday I extended an invitation to come to Israel for the first round of peace negotiations and begin a sincere exchange that would lead to agreement. We hope you will accept our invitation. We will readily reciprocate. I am sure I speak for every man, woman, and child in Israel who join me in the hope that, after all, this gathering will be registered in history as a turning point away from hostility and forward to coexistence and peace. Thank you.

Jordanian Foreign Minister

JN0111092591 Amman Jordan Television Network in English 0735 GMT 1 Nov 91

[Speech by Jordanian Foreign Minister Dr. Kamil Abu-Jabir, head of the joint Jordanian-Palestinian delegation to the Middle East peace conference, in Madrid—live]

[Text] Good morning, Ladies and Gentlemen. In presenting Jordan's concluding remarks, please allow me to reiterate our thanks to the two cosponsors of this conference. To our Spanish host, I wish to pay a special tribute for hosting this conference, especially in this magnificent hall, with all the delegations in the shadow of Lady Justice.

Mr. James Baker, Mr. Boris Pankin: The Jordanian position is based on sound moral grounds, adhering to principles, adhering to provisions of international law, UN resolutions, international legitimacy, and the guarantees of the five permanent members of the Security Council, particularly the two cosponsors.

We had hoped that this will induce a sense of balance, especially since we emphasized the need to structure a negotiated settlement, based on an institutionalized legal framework. Instead, it appears as if time stood still as far as Israel is concerned.

We had hoped, and still do, that the spirit of Madrid would cause a change of heart and attitude, leading to the development of a substantive position. What we heard, however, was in fact a further retreat into the old ideological (?molds) clearly designed to distract words to derail the process. Sadly enough, what we heard was a reiteration of past positions, emphasizing yet another retrenchment, another retreat from the spirit of compromise. Positions clearly designed to [word indistinct] not only historical annals to fit a particular prejudice, but were still to push the other side to climb behind old, rigid, ideological trenches it has been attempting to scale.

Surely the Israelis must have known that when they arrived in Palestine it was not an empty territory, it was inhabited by the ancestors of the Palestinians; even then it was already called the land of milk and honey. It is not our aim now, nor has it been when we first outlined our position, to indulge in an historical debate. We, too, have our vision of history and our tales to tell. And while there is soft elegance in our culture, there is also fierce durability that even now has an opinion about the bold stand we have taken.

We had hoped that we will get out of our past, not in the spirit of denying it—never—but in the hope of looking toward the future, a better, brighter future for the children of the region.

We hope that the participants will capture the present historical moment and live up to it instead of a process of selectively writing of history.

The core of the Arab-Israeli conflict revolves around the occupied territory. To say that the issue is not territory is a gross reduction of the truth. We have come here prepared to make peace within the context of a comprehensive and just peaceful settlement.

The time has come for Israel to recognize the right of self- determination of the Palestinian people on their own territory, their ancestral homeland. No amount of denial of this fact will make it disappear.

The negatives embodied in the Israeli address were in stark contrast to the willingness of the Arab side to negotiate an honorable settlement. Again Israel said: No to Palestinian self- determination; no to withdrawal from the West Bank, including Arab Jerusalem; no to withdrawal from the Gaza Strip, the Golan Heights, Jordanian territory, as well as the Lebanese south.

Bluntly and publicly, Israel effectively declared its intention to maintain its illegal position and continue its settlement program. We hope that the time may have arrived for Israel to overcome the heavy burdens of its past wounds, and to follow a path leading toward the better future. Instead, it continues to cling to yesterday, nursing its mental and physical wounds. We have avoided negativism as well as code words designed to irritate, hoping to take a first step towards bridging the great divide.

We had hoped to silence the call of the wild and the absolutist rhetoric. We emphasize our vision of an honorable, durable, and comprehensive peace; peace with which we, and our children, can live with. We too need to look ourselves in the mirror with pride, and we will. That is why we based our position on 242 and 338, while emphasizing our recognition that even these were less than ultimate justice.

Jordan is irrevocably committed to the noble cause of peace. And we stand ready now, as we have always been, to pay our fair share for its realization. But, let me say it again: We are not seeking peace at any price—far from it. We are seeking justice, fairness, and legality. Israel can have either land or peace, but it cannot have both. It can have the true security that comes from a negotiated political settlement. Force alone will never provide security. Only when it is accepted by its neighbors as part of the region, not merely in it, will Israel have security.

Let me reiterate Jordan's position, which rests on the simple and valid principle of land for peace. That is why we call on Israel to abide by UN Security Council

Resolutions 242, 338, 425 calling upon it to evacuate the occupied territories, the Syrian Golan Heights, and Lebanon.

Israel's refusal to abide by these resolutions undermine the credibility of the world body, and seriously raises the issue of a symmetry and double standards in applying international law.

The Palestinians must have, and must exercise, the right of self-determination on their own soil. That is why the immediate halting of the establishment of settlements is an essential prerequisite for a comprehensive peaceful regional settlement. Not only Israel is in need of security, but every country in the region, too. Considering the imbalance in the military equation, it becomes obvious that the Arab side is the party in more need of security and security guarantees.

Ladies and gentlemen, we have not come to Madrid, the venue of this historic international conference, simply to debate, discuss, or score points against each other. We came here with the intention of seriously considering the elements of a comprehensive peace settlement. Our approach remains constructive, and our faith and confidence in the seriousness and commitment of the cosponsors is unshakeable.

It may be, very well, that Israel wants peace, it may be, but it wants the Arabs alone to pay the price. Again, we find it necessary to emphasize that the issue is territory, and exchange of land for peace, that carries with it the promise of a brighter future, going far, far beyond mere existence. In firmly and clearly calling for an honorable and lasting settlement, we hope to move the region from the past into a promising future. Instead, we find that Israel still has both its feet firmly planted in the past.

We say: Give peace a chance. Give our region a chance to halt, even roll back, the traumatized nihilistic ideological trends that will surely thrive should the hope and the light of peace be extinguished.

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

'Abd-al-Shafi Closing Remarks

JN0111093491 Amman Jordan Television Network in English 0746 GMT 1 Nov 91

[Speech by Dr. Haydar 'Abd-al-Shafi, head of the Palestinian side of the joint Jordanian-Palestinian delegation to the Middle East peace conference, in Madrid—live; opening passage is improvised]

[Text] Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. It is indeed regrettable and disheartening that Mr. Shamir didn't find anything worthy of response in our statement of yesterday except to deal what was there to present the hardships and difficulties that our people are living under occupation. Now, it seems to me very obvious that Mr. Shamir wants to draw us back into the situational polemics and recriminations for which we have decided not to subscribe any more. That Mr. Shamir has left the audience today on the pretext of the Sabbath, also in my opinion, is not warranted. I think our deliberations here are as important as any religious rite. Friday is a holy day for us, and we choose to stay in this audience, rather than to go for our religious rites.

Mr. Pankin, Mr. Baker, Ladies and Gentlemen: We wish first to congratulate the cosponsors for succeeding where so many have failed before. The fact of the conference itself convening is no negligible feat, but a tribute to sheer persistence, tenacity, and hard work. For this we extend our appreciation.

For this historic conference to succeed, it requires—to borrow a literary phrase—a willing suspension of disbelief, the predisposition and ability to enter alien terrain where the signals and signposts are often unfamiliar and the topography uncharted. This solemn endeavor on which we are embarking here in Madrid demands of us a minimal level of sympathetic understanding in order to begin the process of engagement and communication. For this interdependent age demands the rapid evolution of a shared discourse that is capable of generating new and appropriate perceptions, on the basis of which forward-looking attitudes may be formed and accurate road maps drawn.

Failing this, time will not spare us and our peoples will hold us accountable. Thus, we have the task—rather, the duty—of rising above static and hard-set concepts of discarding teleological arguments and regressive ideology, and of abandoning rigid and constricting positions. Such attitudes barricade the speaker behind obdurate and defensive stances, while antagonizing or locking out the audience. Eliciting instant responses through provocation and antagonism would, admittedly, generate energy, but such energy can only be short-lived and, ultimately, destructive. Energy with direction—real momentum emerges from a responsible and responsive engagement between equals, using recognizable terms of reference regardless of the degree of disagreement.

In all honesty, we the Palestinian delegation came here to present you with a challenge, to lay our humanity before you and to recognize yours, to transcend the confines of the past, and to set the tone for a peace process within the framework of mutuality, expansiveness, and acknowledgement. We deliberately refused to limit the options before us to one, or to fall into the trap of reductive entrenchment with a rigid either-or argument.

Ladies and gentlemen, peace requires courage to make and perseverance to forge. In his opening speech, President Bush sent a strong message, not just to the participants, but to the world as a whole, a peace pledge with the dual signs of fairness and legitimacy as necessary components. We were gratified, for the Palestinian initiative is firmly grounded in these two principles. Most speeches which followed reaffirmed them and sought to demonstrate seriousness of intent. The Israeli statement, however, remains the exception, imprisoned in its own anachronistic and antagonistic rhetoric, incapable of responding to the tone and implications of the occasion. But the days of domination, of manipulative politics, are over. And the emergent realities of our contemporary world are consecrating the principles of moral politics and global harmony as the criteria and measures of value. We further find it incomprehensible how Israel can violate with impunity the integrity of the process and the consensus of the participants. UN Security Council Resolution 242 and the principle of territory for peace constitute the terms of reference and the source of legal authority for the conference and negotiations as stated in the letters of invitation. The positive response of the Palestinian people was primarily in recognition and appreciation of this commitment. The essence of 242, as formulated in its own preamble, is the inadmissibility of acquisition of territory by war, thus containing within it an internal and binding definition which renders it incapable of being variously and subjectively interpreted or applied.

We came here to realize its implementation, not to indulge in exegesis or semantics, or to be party to its negation or extraction from the peace agenda. This is not only an Arab and Palestinian requirement, it is also a demand of the international community and a test of validation for the new era in global politics. The same terms articulated in 242 apply to east Jerusalem, which is not only occupied territory, but also a universal symbol and a repository of cultural creativity, spiritual enrichment, and religious tolerance. That today an apartheid-like pass system bars many Palestinians from entering our holy city is both painful and provocative. The gates of Jerusalem must be open. Palestinian Jerusalem is the vehicle of our self-definition and the affirmation of our uninterrupted existence on our land.

Ladies and gentlemen, the issue is land. And what is at stake here is the survival of the Palestinian people on what is left of our olive groves and orchards, our terraced hills and peaceful valleys, our ancestral homes, villages, and cities. International legitimacy demands the restoration of the illegally occupied Arab and Palestinian lands to their rightful owners. Israel must recognize the concept of limits—political, legal, moral, and territorial--and must decide to join the community of nations by accepting the terms of international law and the will of the international community.

No amount of circumlocution or self-deception can alter that fact. Security can never be obtained through the acquisition of other people's territory, and geography is not the criterion for security. The opposite is actually true. Retaining or expanding occupied territory is one sure way of perpetuating hostility and resentment. We are offering the Israeli people a unique chance for genuine security through peace. Only by solving the real grievances and underlying causes of instability and conflict can genuine and long-standing stability and security be obtained.

We the people of Palestine hereby offer the Israelis an alternative path to peace and security: Abandon mutual fear and mistrust; approach us as equals, within a two-state solution; and let us work for the development and prosperity of our region based on mutual benefit and well-being. We have already wasted enough time, energy, and resources locked in this violent embrace of mutual destruction and defensiveness. We urge you to take this opportunity and rise to meet the challenge of peace.

Settlements on confiscated Palestinian land and the expropriation of our resources will surely sabotage the process launched by this conference, for they are major obstacles to peace. They constitute a flagrant violation of Palestinian rights and the Fourth Geneva Convention. All settlement activity and confiscation of Palestinian land must stop, for these measures constitute the institutionalized plunder of our people's heritage and future.

Palestinians are a people with legitimate national rights. We are not the inhabitants of territories, or an accident of history, or an obstacle to Israeli expansionist plans, or an abstract demographic problem. You may wish to close your eyes to this fact, but we are here in the sight of the world, before your very eyes. And we shall not be denied. In exile or under occupation, we are one people, united despite adversity, determined to exercise our right to self-determination and to establish an independent state, led by our own legitimate and acknowledged leadership. The question of all our refugees will be dealt with during the permanent-status negotiations under the terms of UN Resolution 194.

We have already declared our acceptance of transitional phases as part of this process, provided they had the logic of internal coherence and interconnection within a specified, limited time frame and without prejudging the permanent status.

During the transitional phase, Palestinians must have meaningful control over decisions affecting their lives and fate. During this phase, the immediate repatriation of the 1967 displaced persons and the reunion of separated families can be carried out.

We have also expressed the need for protection and third-party intervention in the course of bringing about a settlement under such conditions of disequilibrium between occupier and occupied. For peace as a state of civilizations between societies, real peace between peoples cannot precede the solution of the problems which are the core of the conflict. It is the solution which opens the door to peace and not the other way round.

On these grounds, we hereby publicly and solemnly call upon the cosponsors of the conference, directly or through the United Nations, to place the whole of the occupied Palestinian territories under their trusteeship, pending a final settlement. Palestinian people are willing to entrust you with the protection of their lives and lands, until a fair and legitimate peace is achieved. They are the same people, our Palestinian people, who have celebrated the occasion of this conference by offering olive branches to the Israeli occupation soldiers. Palestinian children were decorating army tanks with this symbol of peace. Our Palestinian people under occupation and in exile were here with us during the past three days, in our minds and hearts, and it is their voice that you have heard.

To the cosponsors and to the international community that seeks the achievement of a just peace in the Middle East, you have given us a fair hearing. You cared enough to listen, and for that we thank you. Thank you.

Lebanese Foreign Minister

NC0111094291 Beirut Radio Lebanon in Arabic 0804 GMT 1 Nov 91

[Speech by Lebanese Foreign Minister Faris Buwayz at the closing session of the Madrid peace conference—live]

[Text] Mr. President: Today we conclude the preliminary stage of the Madrid conference, to which we came with an open mind and a desire to establish peace based on international and legitimate justice and the UN resolutions.

We felt relieved as we listened to the speeches given by the two conference sponsors, Presidents Bush and Gorbachev, and their emphasis on the conference's fundamental issues; namely, respect for international law, the inadmissibility of acquiring land by force, and the need to guarantee people's rights to security and self- determination.

The Lebanese delegation listened with full interest to the speeches by all the parties who have been invited to negotiations to reach the desired peace. Lebanon would like to make the following remarks:

First, the convocation of the conference was an inevitable first step toward realizing its objectives; namely, to establish a just, lasting, and comprehensive peace in our region based on international legitimacy and the UN resolutions;

Second, we believe that the speeches by Presidents Bush and Gorbachev, particularly their emphasis that peace should be established on the basis of justice and fairness, are a valid foundation for the establishment of peace and stability in our region;

Third, the speech given on behalf of the EC is viewed as an appreciated and balanced contribution to sincere efforts to realize the conference's goals. We noted with satisfaction the dedication of a paragraph to Lebanon supporting its demand to implement UN Security Council Resolution 425;

Fourth, listening to the debates, there was an obvious disparity between the Arab stand, which endeavored to overcome the hatred and remnants of the past and open a new chapter of regional relations based on wisdom and rationality, and the Israeli stand, which continued to insist on its traditional ideas and views which clearly prove counter to the regional peace process.

The Israeli delegation's speech not only failed to declare Israel's acceptance of the conference's basic principles, which are based on the unanimity of both its organizers and other participants—namely, the UN resolutions and the formula of land for peace—but also persisted in its erroneous approach and in belittling international legitimacy and the UN Charter and resolutions. We had hoped the Israeli delegation would share our belief that the conference's success depends on a will by all parties to achieve peace, on the need to express this will openly, and on the need to take specific practical measures which are bound to build confidence. We still expect the Israeli party to state openly that they have this will by declaring their commitment to the implementation of Resolutions 242 and 338 and the UN Charter, particularly in terms of their emphasis on the people's right to self-determination, which now should be genuinely within the reach of all, particularly the Palestinian people.

We noticed that the Israeli prime minister in his statement was trying to abolish the UN resolutions and cast doubts on their credibility, although Israel would not have emerged as a state were it not for the UN Security Council resolution which granted Israel part of Palestine.

Moreover, if this is Israel's stand on the UN resolutions, what is the point of holding this conference, which is being held on the basis of UN Resolutions 242 and 338?

Fifth, I move now to the Lebanese issue. Lebanon has announced before and reiterates today its firm demand that Israel should immediately, completely, and unconditionally withdraw from all the Lebanese territories in implementation of UN Security Council Resolution 425. It is quite remarkable that the head of the Israeli delegation spoke about peace, but took no step to match his words. On the contrary, Israel is attacking Lebanon and refusing to implement Resolution 425. Was Israel's escalation of the situation in south Lebanon, which coincided with the conference, the best answer to the principles and objectives of this conference?

Lebanon, a country which seeks peace and has made great strides toward recovery despite difficulties and challenges, announces before all of you its commitment to enforce law and order over all its territories, particularly in the south, as soon as Israel implements Resolution 425 and withdraws its forces behind the international borders in accordance with international law.

The Lebanese delegation must reiterate that the implementation of Resolution 425 should take place today, not tomorrow. This would be a stimulus for the peace conference and a fitting prelude to settling the region's problems.

Sixth, we wish to announce our support for any ideas concerning the future and which aim to develop the region and lay down the foundation for its construction, social justice, and economic prosperity. But we also wish to express our belief that negotiating on present matters is more urgent and beneficial than negotiating on future issues.

Let us first concentrate on the present and reach an agreement on the pressing needs so that we will have time later on to address the future and its concerns. How can we discuss the way to share benefits when we are still weighed down by the burden of losses? Peace would be greatly served by a statement concerning the status of Jerusalem, the cessation of settlement building, and the adherence to the land for peace principle. We believe that to open multilateral negotiations, tangible progress should be made on bilateral ties.

Finally, we note that the head of the Israeli delegation has noted Israel's commitment to preserving Lebanon's independence and its lack of ambition over Lebanese territories. This, however, makes us wonder about Israel's reason for occupying the Lebanese south, its incessant harassment of the population, its instigation of violence, and its provocations and insults against the inhabitants.

Lebanon's independence, which apparently is so important to Israel, begins from the south and cannot be complete as long as the south is under occupation. From the south, Israel has penetrated the Lebanese home front, bringing with it an array of regional and international conflicts. Israel knows full well that Syria has helped the lawful Government of Lebanon to rebuild the state's institutions, consolidate national unity, and disarm the militias. Lebanon's relations with Syria should not be a matter of concern for Israel. Israel is trying to link its occupation with the Syrian presence. The Syrian presence, however, is regulated by the al- Ta'if agreement, which has the endorsement of the international community led by the United States.

Finally, Israel's attempt to link its withdrawal with any other factor would mean a clear refusal to implement Resolution 425, which is unconditional. Thank you.

Al-Shar' Final Address

JN0111105191 Damascus Syrian Arab Republic Radio Network in Arabic 0815 GMT 1 Nov 91

[Speech by Faruq al-Shar', Syrian foreign minister and head of the Syrian delegation to the Middle East peace conference, at the final session in Madrid—live]

[Text] Mr. Chairman James Baker, Mr. Chairman Boris Pankin, and Ladies and Gentlemen: I had planned to read a written statement in reply to the speech the head of the Israeli delegation delivered yesterday, but the head of the Israeli delegation, without showing interest in this historic conference, that is, the peace process, departed from the basic subject upon which this conference was held; namely, the achievement of a just, comprehensive, and lasting peace in the region that has lost security, stability, and balanced development for long decades. Yesterday, some Western journalists said that the speech of the Syrian delegation was tough. I said to them that it was not tough, but expressed bare facts and realities as they are, and I challenged some of them, saying that I would be surprised if the Israeli delegation managed to reply to any paragraph in my speech. That challenge was in its right place because I did not falsely accuse Israel. Therefore, the Israeli prime minister could not reply to any word or expression I used to describe Israeli policy in our region.

In light of the speech delivered by the Israeli prime minister yesterday and despite his departure from the subject today, we should clarify some facts, which are viewed by us, the cosponsors of the conference, and the entire international family as important matters related to the region's future, peace, and security and to the world's stability and security in general. Therefore, I briefly said that the Israeli prime minister did not mention Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338. This means that they are not interested in the basis upon which this conference was held. This constitutes a rejection of the invitations extended by the cosponsors, the United States and the Soviet Union, which said that the conference was to be held on the basis of Resolutions 242 and 338.

Of course, and as result of this, he did not talk about land for peace, because he frankly said that he did not want peace. One who considers the situation will immediately be able to conclude that Shamir said that if the Arab side came to the conference or the talks to discuss land, we would reach a stalemate.

Naturally, I do not want to embark on the historical course the Israeli prime minister took up yesterday because it was a falsified, fabricated course that was not based on facts or neutral world historians; particularly the European and American historians who, as is well known, sympathize with Israel. He is recording his own history, a history belonging to his own mentality. For example, he says that the Palestinian refugees left Palestine because the Arab governments asked them to do so. First and foremost, all this is untrue and the Israeli delegation cannot possibly have in its possession a single document verifying this. Second, if we assume that those Palestinians left upon orders of their governments at that time, why does the head of the present Israeli delegation, who is talking extensively about peace without any substance, not allow them to return to their lands? The Arab governments now agree to that, and in fact even demand it.

The head of the Israeli delegation also openly indicated yesterday that Palestine is the only true home for all the world's Jews. He considers all Jews living in any other country, regardless of how good a host that country is—for example, the United States is indeed hospitable to Jews and treats them the way the Arabs have treated them throughout history—as living in exile, or in the diaspora. This means the Jew in the United States is not an American citizen. His loyalty, as the Israeli prime minister claims, will not go to the United States but rather to Israel, because he is there merely as a temporary resident whose aim is to go to Israel. This is so despite all the support and backing the United States has offered to him in the United States and the international arena. Moreover, they do not want Soviet Jews to be loyal to the Soviet Union. I am confident that his words do not express the true situation. There are many honorable Jews in the Soviet Union, the United States, and Europe who adhere to their loyalty to the countries in which they live and grew up.

Consequently, one concludes that the mere concentration on this point represents a real desire on the part of the Israeli prime minister to maintain this tension, not only in our region but also in the whole world, to maintain the Jewish question within our minds. He does not want Jews to be treated equally. He always wants to depict the Jews as oppressed and agonized, contrary to their present situation in the world. On the contrary. There are even such attempts when he talks, for example, about Syrian Jews. Syrian Jews are subject to Syrian law like any other Syrian citizen—Muslim or Christian. These are our laws. But Israel wants us to give privileges to the Syrian citizen simply because he is Jewish. Just imagine that. They know the true situation and the whole world knows that. Whoever has visited Syria knows, and historians know this as well, that the Syrian Jew enjoys all the equality and freedom enjoyed by all other Syrian citizens. I will very briefly quote a paragraph from a report from a European parliamentary delegation that visited Damascus about two months ago.

I shall read the text. This parliamentarian delegation presented the following report to the European Parliament at one of its sessions to discuss Syrian Jews. The European report states: For those who have little knowledge of the Arab Muslim states, Syria has outstanding religious freedom. We were greatly surprised to learn about the situation. Religious freedom is complete in Syria because the state considers itself secular. Judaism, Catholicism, Orthodoxy, and Islam, with their various sects, express themselves and follow their religious rites with complete freedom in Syria. That was the report.

Naturally, it is known that through the Israeli embassies in Europe they distribute reports to many countries in the world, reports that talk about the oppression of Jews. They pay a group of people—about 20 or 50 people—to demonstrate outside Syrian embassies, carrying placards that falsely state that Syrian Jews are oppressed or held hostage in Syria. This is silly and nonsense.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to refer to an important point, since peace is the issue of this conference. In his speech yesterday, the head of the Israeli delegation admitted that he will not return any part of territory, especially when he referred to the area concerning Palestine. He referred to an area exceeding the area of Palestine under Mandate. This means that he thinks about, even confirms, the occupation of the West Bank, Gaza, Jerusalem, and the Golan Heights. Anyone who reads the speech closely will discover that fact.

Arabs are the only people to have lived in Palestine for thousands of years. Even when the Jews arrived from the south across the Sinai, Palestinians were there in Palestine. I do not want to discuss that era. They continued to live there until now. I ask one question only: If the Israeli prime minister says that Jews have the right to return to Palestine after an absence of over 2,000 years, how can that right be denied to the Palestinian, who left it only 40 years ago? Which is more realistic: The return of the Palestinian, who still knows the address of his house—some of them still even have the key to that house—or to talk about the return of the Jews, who were there more than 2,000 years ago? This is a falsehood, as big as the difference between the 40 and the 4,000 years, which the head of the Israeli Government talked about yesterday.

He talks about freedom of religion. We all know, from the Western media, how they encourage Israeli extremists to destroy the sacred places. And we know about the fire in the al-Aqsa Mosque and the attempt to blow up the entire al-Aqsa Mosque. They claim to hold fake trials for those people.

Israel's control of Jerusalem is not a guarantee for any of the three religions that this city will remain holy and its spiritual heritage immortal, or remain the city of peace, as long as it continues to be under the control of the Israelis and the boots of their soldiers march over its streets. I shall finish in a short while, Mr. Chairman, because I really wanted to focus on the peace for which we have come. Before that, however, I shall just show you an old photograph of Mr. Shamir at the age of 32. The information, distributed in Europe at the time, says he is 32 years old, 165 cm tall, and the other descriptions you all know. But why was this photograph distributed? Because he was a wanted man. He himself admitted that he was a terrorist. He himself admitted that he practiced terrorism and aided in the assassination of UN mediator Count Bernadotte in 1948, as far as I recall. He kills the peace mediators, and then he talks of Syria, Lebanon, and terrorism.

I shall give you another example on this subject. Israel shot down a civilian airliner in 1954, a Syrian civilian airliner.... [changes though] I apologize, hijacked a Syrian civilian airliner; the one it downed was a Libyan civilian airliner. The problem is that I do not have enough time because the Israeli terrorist acts require a volume, not just 15 minutes. I would like quickly to say, however, that Israel hijacked a Syrian civilian airliner in 1954. It was carrying civilian passengers between Cairo and Damascus. Israel also downed a Libyan civilian airliner in 1973, as I recall, and killed more than 100 civilian passengers on board. Israel also hijacked a Syrian airliner six or seven years ago. A Syrian political delegation was aboard that plane. Had Syria not immediately protested to the Security Council and raised the issue, that civilian airliner would not have been released.

I spoke yesterday of our concept of terrorism and I think he could not reply to that. I do not want to bother you with further details. Anyone who wishes so can go back to what I said. He says Israel occupied....[changes thought] no, he does not recognize occupation, my apology. He says the 1967 war was a defensive act and they say in their media that it was the Arabs who attacked Israel in 1967. They greatly despise historians, and I would like to say in one final word that regardless of who occupied and who started the 1967 war, the resolution is clear, Mr. Chairman. It bars the acquisition of others' territories by war. Hence, these territories should be returned.

Concluding with a simple word, Mr. Chairman, I say we have come for peace and shall continue to work for peace, proceeding from our faith in this peace. We declare with confidence and determination our intention to work for a just and comprehensive peace that liberates the land and guarantees rights and security of all. We will not be very surprised if the Israeli side avoids continuing the bilateral talks or fabricates excuses to prevent their continuation in Madrid. I apologize, Mr. Chairman, for taking so long, but it was necessary to clarify the facts. I apologize. Thank you. [applause]

Egyptian Foreign Minister

JN0111113191 Amman Jordan Television Network in English 0838 GMT 1 Nov 91

[Speech by 'Amr Musa, Egyptian foreign minister and head of Egypt's delegation to the Middle East peace conference, at the final session in Madrid on 1 November—live]

[Text] Cochairmen, Distinguished Delegates: Our meeting here, during the past three days, in these fabulous surroundings and warm hospitality graciously provided by our Spanish hosts, has been described as historic and momentous. I have been reflecting upon the real meaning of the conference, as I looked across this T-shaped conference table and listened to the different views of the parties. I asked myself: Are we on the threshold of a new era in the Middle East, as indeed we should be? The answer is in the affirmative. For whatever the positions of one party or the other, we cannot, and we should not, continue arguing, trading accusations and recriminations.

Old arguments and archaic strategies should be left at the wayside the moment we leave this conference. We have listened, especially today, to some passionate speeches, which manifest, once again, how acute the conflict in the Middle East is, and how the change in attitudes, change in concepts, is badly needed. And I address Israel mainly.

Speeches, such as one we heard today, do not help the process of peace. This is not the language of peace. We came to negotiate, we came to talk to each other about the future. And we have a responsibility to do everything possible to make this endeavor succeed.

Arab nations have come here to achieve peace with Israel. Her status is not questioned, nor in doubt. Israel, we hope, has come to find peace with the Arabs, including, and in particular, with the Palestinians. A matter which entails by necessity the respect of their rights in territory and in self-determination. This is a sine qua non for peace. The cosponsors have committed themselves to continue working together, rather than against each other in the Middle East. This is a very important fact and very positive point.

Our meeting here, ladies and gentlemen, must obviate past practices. Misrepresentation of facts must stop. Wild dreams of expansion must come to an end. Illegal acts such as building settlements should be frozen. More than anything else, and as never before, this conference places an awesome responsibility on the parties to demonstrate that peace has a chance, and that coming here was not in vain. This solemn quest for peace must be pursued, its full potential realized.

In the next few days, and in the weeks and months to come, different forms of negotiations shall, hopefully, commence. In the process, there will be continuing difficulties, moments of tension. But we must continue our search for peace, a just and fair peace, not peace at any price, but peace based on legality, on Resolutions 242 and 338. Peace at the end must prevail.

Egypt, a nation that has been at the forefront, both in war and in peace, a nation with deep Arab roots and peaceful relations with the Jewish state, knows more than anyone else in the Middle East the agony of war and the virtue of peace. From this unique perspective, and unparalleled experience, at least so far, Egypt shall continue to support the legitimate rights of all the nations in the region and participate in laying down the foundations for a stable, secure, and prosperous Middle East. Egypt shall fulfill her role in the upcoming negotiations in order to ensure peace in the Middle East and address regional problems, in particular the arms race and the problem of the proliferation of arms of mass destruction, especially nuclear weapons.

Our common objective must be a consensus on how to coexist as equals. This will no doubt entail many difficult decisions for all sides. We must learn to reconcile ourselves with reality. There cannot be peace if we allow our dreams to cloud our vision. There can only be genuine peace, with all its implications, when Israel chooses sincerely to live with the Arabs and the Palestinians, respecting their legitimate rights and ending the occupation of Arab lands.

Israel also has rights, and the Arab side has demonstrated readiness to respect those rights as stipulated in Resolutions 242 and 338. There is no escape from Resolutions 242 and 338.

We have a long road ahead of us. All of us have a contribution to make in ensuring that we march on. Confidence that all parties are sincerely pursuing peace will have to be continuously reinforced. We may need to reassure one another at each hurdle that there have been no regressions from the achievements of this conference in Madrid. Palestinian suffering must be alleviated. Many other confidence-building measures must be implemented.

Peace is not a luxury, nor an option. Peace is an imperative. We must overcome our differences, and we shall overcome our differences. Thank you.

EC's Van Den Broek

LD0111113191 Madrid TVE Internacional Television in Spanish 0847 GMT 1 Nov 91

[Speech by Hans van den Broek, Netherlands foreign minister and EC representative, at final session of the Middle East peace conference in Madrid's Palacio Real on 1 November—live, speaking in English with simultaneous Spanish voiceover]

[Text] Mr. Chairman, thank you for granting me the opportunity to speak for a few minutes. We were not scheduled to take part in this second round, but I would like to take advantage of this opportunity to, above all, congratulate our cosponsors on bringing about the convening of this inaugural ceremony, this Madrid conference, as it is the first time we have seen many of these parties. In any case, I believe this is a historic milestone. I believe this is just a beginning, but a very important one in itself, and having listened to all the speeches I indeed am convinced even more than before of how much we need a gradual step- by-step process accompanied by measures which can promote mutual confidence from the start.

The biggest problem we have to overcome in the initial stage of the negotiating process, as far as I have been able to see, is overcoming mistrust, creating more sound foundations in order thus to be able to achieve negotiations with substance and good faith. Many arguments have been laid out, many valuable incentives have been given by several delegations; others have been accused of being too cautious, perhaps too backward-looking. We believe that bridges can be built and that these bridges must be built. The European Community has traditional and historic links with the Middle East and with all the sides in question. The European Community and its member states do not favor one point of view or another, but rather favor the law, peace, and encompassing security and justice for all without exception. We will continue to stand ready to help in this cause whatever side may ask for our help and will maintain close and continuous consultations with the cosponsors in order to be sure that we are encouraging this process by dint of coherent action.

A Middle East which finds peace can be a blessing not just for its own people, not just for its own region, but for the whole world. It has a lot to offer and a lot to give, and we are convinced and have the determination to help the Middle East to achieve this goal and play this part—and, as I said in my first speech the day before yesterday, the European Community is not only fully prepared not just to enter into a constructive association with all of you, but also to achieve concrete association, since we believe that along with bilateral negotiations, multilateral talks also need to be started at the appropriate time, not at the expense of the political process, but alongside it. I thus stress that all the sides are masters of their own decisions and can decide when the results achieved on a bilateral level can be applied at a different level, but it is important for us to identify the marvelous possibilities that exist. When peace is achieved, the prospects for cooperation in the region and the contribution which the European Community can make, we believe, could be identified already at an early stage, thus giving an additional incentive. This would serve as an additional incentive for all the parties to reach a political solution which would eventually permit peace, but also economic well-being and prosperity for all. On behalf of the European Community and the 12 member countries, I promise our attendance and availability throughout the whole of the process for whatever parties wish it. Thank you.

Israelis React to Al-Shar' Closing Address

Al-Shar' Remarks Not 'Relevant'

TA0111125691 Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in Hebrew 1224 GMT 1 Nov 91

[Telephone interview with Cabinet Secretary Elyaqim Rubinstein by Shalom Qital—live]

[Text] [Qital] Shalom, Elyaqim Rubinstein.
[Rubinstein] Good afternoon.

[Qital] Good afternoon?
[Rubinstein] Certainly.

[Qital] What did you make of Faruq al-Shar's remarks?
[Rubinstein] Do you mean his nasty speech this morning, or his final comment?

[Qital] We will deal with the nasty speech later; let us now discuss the comment which refers to the next phase of the talks.
[Rubinstein] It is not important or relevant. He tried to say that this conference will be held intermittently and will resume here (?under patronage) when it is convened. Naturally, this is not the correct presentation of the facts; this, incidentally, was made plain here in a conversation with the secretary of state, who will undoubtedly reiterate this in public. It is also written in the invitations to the conference. The conference ended today, and it can reconvene only if all the parties so agree. As everyone knows, it is not such a cheery prospect for Israel to do so at any time. I cannot recall such a parallel, but this is an irrelevant detail. There is no way the conference can be reconvened without the consent of all the parties.

[Qital] The question is whether Faruq al-Shar' meant the conference plenum or the bilateral talks, which are expected to start on Sunday in Madrid?
[Rubinstein] Shalom, it is a waste of time to discuss what he said or did not say. The facts are as follows: We hope

that soon we will be advised that on Sunday or thereabouts the bilateral meetings between Israel and each one of these delegations will begin—separately, of course, with the Jordanian-Palestinian delegation, the Lebanese delegation, and the Syrian delegation—so that these talks will be launched in the single bilateral meeting here in Madrid, which we accepted. Later, of course, we hope it will continue in the region, but negotiations are still under way on this.

[Qital] Let me ask you whether you or any other member of the Israeli delegation knows for certain that the Syrians will be at all ready to come for a face-to-face meeting on Sunday?
[Rubinstein] I cannot say that I know this for sure, but I suspect there are problems in this regard. At any rate, if the venue for the meeting is set, we will be there.

[Qital] It is obvious that Israel will attend, the problem, as I understand it....
[Rubinstein, interrupting] Look, there is no need to repeat the Syrians' position over and over; they stated it quite clearly and it does not warrant any further explanation. It raises gloomy thoughts about what they term peace negotiations.

[Qital] Do we know for certain that the bilateral talks will begin in Madrid on Sunday?
[Rubinstein] We will know this very shortly. In any case, I presume we will be advised when and if such talks are announced. Israel is interested in such talks, although Madrid, of course, is only one meeting intended to determine the venue for the next meetings. We hope that since all the parties say they want a process, they will also comply with our suggestions on the matter.

[Qital] Mr. Rubinstein, what do you think about James Baker's speech?
[Rubinstein] I do not think it is up to me to grade James Baker's speech. His speech included some remarks that were not very positive about the process. I do not want to add anything more beyond that.

[Qital] After his speech and Faruq al-Shar's heckling, I saw James Baker approach you and talk to you for some length of time.
[Rubinstein] Among other things, the purpose of the talk was to clarify the misunderstanding, as it were, created by the Syrian foreign minister; however, it included some other issues which I will definitely not dwell on.

[Qital] Is James Baker optimistic in the sense that the Syrians are still part of the process?
[Rubinstein] I would not like to elaborate on this point beyond what I have already said.

[Qital] Let me go back to Faruq al-Shar's lengthy speech. Were you upset?
[Rubinstein] Upset is not the right word. I thought to myself: What does this man want? What does his country want? Does it want peace? If it does, why does it repeat the base and trite rhetoric which belongs in the garbage can of history and which we have been hearing from its speakers for dozens of years at the United Nations and elsewhere? These obscene and foolish gestures of waving all sorts of papers and so forth—this was neither the time nor the place for that, but he chose to do it. I do not think there was even one person among the participants in the conference who thought this fit and proper—and I am not just talking about the members of the Israeli delegation. He did it, however, and I hope the response will be in kind.

Speech Seen As Being 'Anti-Semitic'

TA0111110091 Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in Hebrew 1006 GMT 1 Nov 91

[Telephone interview with political reporter Arye Golan in Palacio Real by Shalom Qital—live]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] [Qital] Did you hear any reaction from the Israeli delegation to the harsh statements by Faruq al-Shar', including his personal attacks on the prime minister?

[Golan] Yes, certainly. We tried to talk to several members of the Israeli delegation, and among them there is the consensus that without a doubt Faruq al-Shar' delivered a speech with distinctly anti-Semitic tones. He talked about the Jews' problem of dual allegiance and in general said a lot about the Jews—giving them more time than he did Israelis—and their split personality. So, not only was this an anti-Semitic expression, it was actually an attempt to drive another wedge, or widen the crack, between U.S. Jewry and the U.S. Administration or President Bush. We will recall President Bush's speech at the time, his fist clenched, banging on the lectern; his mention of the money every American must pay for every Israeli—$1,000 a year—other comments, and so on. All this has increased anti-Semitism in the United States. Well, Syria is trying to squeeze itself into this crack and widen even further the differences of opinion, shall we say, between U.S. Jewry and the administration. [passage omitted]

'Cheap Propaganda'

TA0111123191 Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in Hebrew 1100 GMT 1 Nov 91

[Text] Yosi Olmert, one of the spokesmen for the Israeli delegation in Madrid, reacted to the Syrian foreign minister's address by saying that it was nothing but cheap propaganda. Faruq al-Shar's conduct, he said, was another manifestation of the totally negative attitude of the Syrians. We came to discuss peace, while others are seeking propaganda achievements.

As for al-Shar's attempts to portray the prime minister as a terrorist, Olmert said that this charge is totally unfounded and these remarks stand out when voiced by a representative of a regime that murdered civilians in Syria, Lebanon, and in other Arab countries.

Photo of 'Terrorist' Shamir Protested

LD0111133991 Madrid RNE-1 Radio Network in Spanish 1100 GMT 1 Nov 91

[Text] The Israeli delegation has issued a note in which it answers what it calls the violent attack by the Syrian delegation against Israel and the whole Jewish population of the world. We recall specifically the photograph in which Yitzhaq Shamir, current Israeli prime minister, at the age of 33, appeared as a member of a terrorist organization. In this note, the Israeli delegation says that this kind of attack only fans extremism and does not help in finding a moderate solution. It also stresses that the best way of forestalling these attacks is to enter once and for all into bilateral negotiations. The Israeli delegation says that only this can be replaced with dialogue. [sentence as heard].

Shamir, Pankin Discuss Opening of Embassies

TA3110212991 Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in Hebrew 2000 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Text] Prime Minister Yitzhaq Shamir met this evening with Soviet Foreign Minister Boris Pankin to discuss the practical details concerning the opening of the embassies in Moscow and Tel Aviv following the resumption of full diplomatic relations between the USSR and Israel. Our correspondent in Madrid Arye Golan reports that Pankin, upon leaving the meeting with Prime Minister Shamir, said he will continue to discuss this issue on Sunday and that it will be learned tomorrow when the first bilateral deliberations between Israel and the Arab delegations will take place.

Pankin Proposes Cyprus for Talks

TA3110214091 Jerusalem Israel Television Network in Hebrew 2020 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Talk between anchorman Hayim Yavin and political correspondent Gadi Sukenik at the Madrid media center—live]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] [Sukenik] Let us watch footage of the meeting Prime Minister Shamir held a short while ago with Soviet Foreign Minister Pankin, who came to Shamir's hotel and held an unscheduled meeting with him.

[Yavin] Is it true Boris Pankin suggested Cyprus as a possible location?

[Sukenik] That is correct. The main issue discussed in this meeting, which lasted for approximately one hour, was the location of the direct talks between Israel and its neighbors, the issue that so far remains unresolved. After the photographers left, the report leaked out that Pankin proposed a neutral location. The prime minister is insistent. He is determined. He had reluctantly agreed to compromise on some issues on the eve of the conference and during its convocation, mainly on the Palestinian issue. Now that the conference is nearly over—it is ending tomorrow—and all the ceremonies are over, he is starting to get tougher. He is adamant that the talks be held alternately in Israel and in the neighboring countries, but the Arabs firmly oppose this and the Soviets and the Americans are proposing neutral locations. Cyprus was one of the more serious proposals raised by Pankin during tonight's closed meeting. Israel, however, has not agreed so far. [passage omitted]

More on Mubarak Letter to Shamir

JN3110193091 Paris Radio Monte Carlo in Arabic 1745 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Mustafa Bakri report from Cairo]

[Text] Egyptian Foreign Minister 'Amr Musa has delivered to Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhaq Shamir a letter from President Mubarak in which he emphasized the need for Israel's attendance at the Madrid peace conference to realize only peace, and that Shamir should commit himself to removing all the obstacles that could hinder peaceful steps.

An informed Egyptian source told our radio that history would judge that Shamir had realized Arab-Israeli reconciliation and had established Arab-Israeli security and coexistence if he appreciated the importance of peace and achieved this step.

Mubarak warned that if Israel did not respond to the voice of peace in Madrid, the consequences would be very detrimental to all the states in the region. He said that if negotiations proved to have failed, then the language of war and threats would become settled in all minds during the next stage. Mubarak said that when they had decided to go to the Madrid conference, all the Arab states had one aim in mind—namely, to realize final peace with Israel.

In his letter to Shamir, Mubarak suggested that even if Israel does not adopt the policy of stopping the construction of settlements or withdraw from the occupied territories, then Israeli officials should stop making statements that, to the Arab negotiators, represent a kind of provocation. Mubarak added that the Israeli statements that are hostile to the peace process constitute a basic obstacle to removing the barriers of mistrust and to constructive work at the conference. Mubarak expressed readiness to meet with Shamir if he succeeded in passing the first stage and began the second in a manner conducive to realizing a comprehensive peace with the Arab states.

Mubarak expressed his agreement that all regional issues that are of interest to Israel could be resolved if the second phase of negotiations realize real progress.

Egypt's Musa Comments Before Meeting Pankin

NC3110202791 London MBC Television in Arabic 1800 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Text] As part of the intense diplomatic activity on the sideline of the peace conference, Egyptian Foreign Minister 'Amr Musa met this afternoon with his Soviet counterpart Boris Pankin. A few minutes before the meeting, our correspondent Nidal Qabalan asked him if Egypt's insistence on the need to implement UN Resolutions 242 and 338 is principled and not negotiable. The Egyptian minister answered:

[Begin recording] [Musa] We hope that Egypt's weight as well as other efforts will lead to swift results. Of course, we had a lengthy experience, but we also achieved success. As much as the experience was difficult and bitter, as you have said, the success was clear and Egypt recovered the entire Sinai. Since the beginning of the negotiations with Israel, we started to discuss the issues of the Palestinians and the occupation of the West Bank. Much was said at the time and it is all placed at the disposal of the Palestinians should they want to benefit from it. In the meantime, we will continue to be in contact and to consult with all parties. As you know, our stand is clear. We are an Arab country, not a mediator, but we will take advantage of our relations with Israel to give momentum to the peace process and try to persuade it of the need to move forward toward making peace with the Arab states based on the land for peace principle and recognition of the Palestinian people's known national rights.

[Qabalan] Your remarks, both in Cairo prior to your arrival in Madrid and here in yesterday's speech, have shown a firm, clear, and unambiguous Egyptian position. You back UN Resolutions 242 and 338, which demand withdrawal from all the occupied territories. Is this a principled and unwavering Egyptian position?

[Musa] Certainly it is a principled Egyptian position, and it is the same position that applied to Sinai. As for what the parties will agree upon during the current or coming round of negotiations, it is up to them to agree on what they want. There are certain rules from which we do not want to deviate, however, because such a deviation will jeopardize the peace process itself. Israel cannot continue to occupy territories, build settlements, and refuse to discuss some important topics at the negotiating table. At the same time, the Arab parties must take into account that this process is a balanced one and that Israel has some demands they must consider so that the process will be balanced. No party will get 100 percent. There must be commitments versus rights. As you heard the Egyptian position yesterday, we do not object to the slogan of peace in exchange for peace that was put forward by Israel, although we are against all slogans in general. We said we do not mind peace in exchange for peace, but what does it mean? It means right in exchange for right, commitment in exchange for commitment, and security in exchange for security. There are two sides to every single element, and Israel must recognize the right, honor the commitment, and realize that security is not its security alone, but that of the entire region. [end recording]

Role in Bilateral Talks Discussed

NC3110195891 Cairo Egyptian Space Channel in Arabic 1944 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Text] Our correspondent in Madrid has just informed us that Egypt has stated that it is willing to participate in the second stage of the peace process when the bilateral talks between the various parties begin. The USSR has also expressed determination to participate in these talks.

These statements were made during a meeting between Foreign Minister 'Amr Musa and Soviet Foreign Minister Boris Pankin.

Views Role in Multilateral Talks

NC3110152091 Cairo MENA in Arabic 1402 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Text] Madrid, 31 Oct (MENA)—Foreign Minister 'Amr Musa today resumed his intensive contacts with peace conference participants, meeting Soviet Foreign Minister Boris Pankin. The two reviewed conference proceedings and the need to intensify efforts for a just and comprehensive peace in the region.

Musa then conferred with Netherlands Foreign Minister Hans van den Broek, current EC chairman and its representative in Madrid. Present was Abel Matutes, official in charge of Arab-European relations and European cooperation with the Mediterranean countries; Egyptian Ambassador Ahmad Abu-al-Ghayt, from the foreign minister's office; and Dr. 'Ali-al-Din Hilal, Egyptian delegation member. They discussed multilateral talks to be held two weeks from the beginning of the conference. Both sides emphasized their intention to take part in the talks, which will bring together Arab and European states, Japan, and Canada to discuss topics related to regional cooperation in the Middle East, the promotion of economic development in the region, as part of a comprehensive settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict, and outside parties' help to consolidate the peace process.

Bilateral Negotiations Due To Begin 3 Nov

LD3110185391 Madrid TVE Internacional Television in Spanish 1831 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Text] The bilateral negotiations, that is, the second phase of the peace conference on the Middle East, will begin in Madrid on Sunday [3 November]. Our colleagues from the newsroom have just passed this information to us. It has been confirmed by Yosef Hadas, director general of the Israeli Foreign ministry.

Heads of Israeli Teams Named

TA0111100791 Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in Hebrew 0940 GMT 1 Nov 91

[Report by Shalom Qital and Yig'al Rom]

[Excerpts] Amid the big dispute with Syria and other external disagreements, there also are disputes at home. Here is a very interesting report: It turns out that the battle between the Prime Minister's Office and the Foreign Ministry has heated up. Yig'al Rom has a hot report that Yosef Hadas, acting Foreign Ministry director general, and Eytan Bentzur—whom we saw accompanying the prime minister to the aircraft taking him back home—not only accompanied him, they actually flew back with him. The reason for this is a particular development.

The Foreign Ministry failed to reach an agreement with the Prime Minister's Office on who will head the bilateral committees that are expected to meet in a day or two, at the end of the first stage of the peace conference. The two Foreign Ministry personnel also were accompanied by Barukh Bina, the acting Foreign Ministry spokesman, and two aides—the name of one of whom is David Sultan—and all of them flew back to Israel. Deputy Foreign Minister Binyamin Netanyahu is the only Foreign Ministry member on the delegation who is still here. He remained behind as acting head of the delegation. [passage omitted]

Let us again reiterate the decision on the heads of the committees: The head of the committee that will conduct the bilateral negotiations will be Yosi Ben-Aharon, director general of the Prime Minister's Office; the committee for negotiations with the Jordanian-Palestinian delegation will be headed by Cabinet Secretary Elyaqim Rubinstein; and the committee for talks with Lebanon is expected to be headed by a Defense Ministry representative. The man on the spot in that category is Salay Meridor, the defense minister's personal aide, but Uri Lubrani [coordinator of government activities in Lebanon] has also been mentioned in this context.

Dispute Over Venue Could Delay Talks

TA3110214591 Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in Hebrew 2100 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Text] David Kimche, one of Prime Minister Shamir's advisers, this evening said that disagreement over the location of the bilateral talks could delay the continuation of the talks and that they might not be held next week as planned. Kimche, former Foreign Ministry director general, said he held open conversations with Jordanians and Palestinians today, and even spoke with members of the Syrian delegation.

Israel's Netanyahu Meets With Arab Media

TA3110203091

[Editorial Report] Jerusalem Israel Television Network in Hebrew at 1740 GMT on 31 October begins a live broadcast of Israeli Deputy Foreign Minister Binyamin Netanyahu's "special," "impromptu" news conference with Arab media correspondents in Madrid, which was organized by the private Arab satellite broadcasting company Middle East Broadcasting Corporation. The occasion is described as "unprecedented" by Jerusalem Television's moderator Hayim Yavin.

Deputy Foreign Minister Netanyahu is speaking in English, and the Arab correspondents' questions are in Arabic or English. A sporadically superimposed Hebrew paraphrasing makes large portions indistinct.

Deputy Foreign Minister Netanyahu is asked whether Israel will continue to occupy the territories and blame the Palestinians for historical developments. Netanyahu says that setting the record straight is important for the Jews because the Arabs have falsified history and tried to portray the Jews as the aggressors in the 1967 war, though it was the Arabs "who wanted to put the noose of death around us." Netanyahu says we must "either put history aside or put history straight." Netanyahu says Israel "wants to begin a clean slate."

Netanyahu is asked about the gaps between Israel's positions and those of the Arab countries and whether Israel would agree to hold a referendum in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip to decide whether Israel would have to return territory. Netanyahu replies that today's speeches indicate "we are very far apart," but that, as an old hand at the United Nations, he understands that peace can only be achieved by "face-to-face negotiations." He cites the Egyptian- Israeli peace treaty as an example. Therefore, Netanyahu says: "I do not want to base my hopes on the UN-type of speeches that I heard this afternoon. I refuse to give up hope." Responding to the second question, Netanyahu reiterates that Israeli citizens hold a referendum every four years in the form of general elections. Noting that the concept of democracy "is now gaining ground in all of the world," Netanyahu asserts that Israel would like to witness democratic developments in the Arab world, "as democracy is an essential for peace." In the territories "where we have some influence," Israel has proposed "the Israeli peace plan, which allows, and in fact facilitates and calls for, the Palestinian Arabs in the territories to have elections." Israel will then be able to talk with officials "who have the mandate of the people in the territories." Israel wants to talk to leaders who are chosen "not by the barrel of the gun or by fiat from Tunis," but "by popular will expressed by elections." Netanyahu notes that the Palestinian delegates to the Madrid conference are ordering armored cars out of fear for their lives, fear from the "supporters from Tunis" who "can put a bullet in their heads. This system of bullet government and bodies is what has caused all the problems." Netanyahu asserts that the problems can be solved much more quickly if democratization begins in the Arab world.

East Jerusalem correspondent Da'ud Kuttab asks: "How can there be democracy under occupation? How can we have elections if the parties that most of the Palestinians support are illegal?" Kuttab also rejects Netanyahu's remarks about Palestinian internecine killings for political reasons.

Netanyahu replies that Israel's "whole proposal is to end military government" and move on to elections that will "facilitate a final settlement." He notes that at the end of World War II democratic Germany was also born from elections held under military occupation. Israel wants to "end the military government and move on to a negotiated peace, to decide where the borders will be." He adds "we will have our views and the Arabs will have their views." He says the sides must have "discussion come not from the end of a gun and a barrel of weapons, or the bombs, but to have it done through elected representatives."

The same Arab correspondent asks whether Israel will recognize the PLO. Netanyahu replies that "the PLO, as far as we are concerned, should be subject to a general criteria." He notes that "in every part of the world, people negotiate with people, adversaries negotiate with adversaries, and the only people you can make peace with are enemies, providing—and this is an important point—that the enemy wants peace." Netanyahu asserts that an enemy organization that annually calls for your destruction in its charter, which "is a death warrant on Israel," an enemy that is "not really reconciled to your existence" and that "wants to use the negotiations or the political process not to arrive at peace but to arrive at peace when you do not exist" is the "only kind of organization or party that we cannot negotiate with." Netanyahu again calls on any and all Arab officials to meet him in public and not only "in secret meetings" and to shake off the fear that they will be killed if they shake hands with him. Netanyahu says that "far too many have been killed for a simple view that says that they want to go on living their simple ordinary lives." He recounts how a young Palestinian nurse was brutally murdered for "collaboration" after "treating Palestinian Arabs at an Israeli-funded government hospital."

Challenged that young children have also been murdered by Israeli soldiers, Netanyahu claims that "one of the greatest tragedies has been the introduction of children into wars." He asserts that this practice must end. Netanyahu says that Israel "is prepared right now, right now, to enter negotiations with everyone" so that we can end this bloodshed on all sides.

Asked by "a Druze correspondent based in London" whether he feels that the United States should apply pressure to achieve democratic reforms in the Arab world, and whether it is proper for the United States to preach democracy while refraining from even mentioning the issue to Arab regimes, Netanyahu replies that he would like to see the Arab people fight for democracy despite the danger. He says: "Then we will have peace for a very simple reason: Despotisms tend to war but democracies tend to peace."

Asked whether Israel would accept the results of a Palestinian referendum or elections, even if it were known in advance that the PLO would win a sweeping victory, Netanyahu says that holding elections is necessary, but that occasionally "elections not cemented in democratic traditions have produced disaster," as was the case with Hitler. Netanyahu says that "if the elections produce a party that calls for the destruction of the other party, then obviously the path to peace will be blocked." Israel would like to see "both democratization and a change of heart." Israel wants the Palestinians to accept Israel's existence and its right to exist, "and that is incompatible with the PLO charter." Netanyahu notes that progress will be made if we have a process of democratization along with reconciliation.

A correspondent accuses Netanyahu of having known the questions in advance and of exploiting the news conference to present his positions to an Arab audience. He is then asked by the same correspondent whether Israel came to the conference to address the outstanding issues or merely to talk about hand shaking and reconciliation. What law allows Israel to hold on to territory it seized in the 1967 war, the correspondent asks.

Netanyahu denies the first charge, saying he does badly with programmed questions. As for the second charge, he says that Israel came "to begin to solve" the problems, but that the conference is too short to remove all the enmity. Netanyahu proposes that the parties "sit down for long negotiations" and hammer out every issue between the parties. Netanyahu acknowledges that "nobody will be completely satisfied" but that "overall, our peoples and the region will have made an enormous step forward."

Netanyahu goes on to answer the question about Israel's claim to the occupied territory. Netanyahu asserts that Germany lost territory as a result of its aggression in World War II. He notes that "most of the countries in the United Nations, almost all of them, are countries that came into being as a result of historical processes of conflict" and that, therefore, "sometimes territories are acquired by force." Although Netanyahu does not believe in the forceful acquisition of territories, it was Israel that was attacked. Netanyahu then calls on the Arabs to abandon the slogans and "get on with the business of negotiation."

The correspondent, however, notes that there was no Palestinian state to attack Israel at the time. Netanyahu thanks the correspondent for the "important point" he is making because "most of the world thinks there was a Palestinian state—that Israel somehow came into a Palestinian state, took it away and that is it." Netanyahu recounts the history of Israel's conflicts with the Arabs who have tried "to annihilate Israel" since 1948. Netanyahu then speaks of the misery in the Palestinian refugee camps, saying "that we have to make progress" and "rehabilitate the refugees" but that "Arab radicals do not want to solve this problem." Israel is willing to resolve this problem "no matter where the borders are drawn."

Netanyahu is asked whether Israel will allow Palestinians from East Jerusalem to vote in the elections and is asked to show the connection between ending the occupation of territories and having a democratic government.

Netanyahu notes that "the question of Jerusalem is perhaps the most sensitive one." Israel "suggested that this issue be deferred to the last part of the negotiations," as this issue could blow up the negotiations. He says that all the parties had agreed on this. Netanyahu suggests "that what we should do is try to agree on things that we can agree and leave the things that we know are going to be the most difficult to arrive at an agreement for the end." As for the relationship between peace and democracy, he says the kind of peace we could achieve would "be very different" if the region were democratic.

Asked if his repeated calls for democratization did not constitute an instigation against the Arab governments, while the United States and the USSR could sign peace treaties even though the Soviet Union was undemocratic for 70 years, Netanyahu asserts that he is not calling "for incitement against the Arab governments" as he does not want to "intervene" in their domestic affairs; however, he says, the whole world accepts the principle of democracy, and even the Arab delegates constantly invoke the term.

Palestinian Affairs

'Arafat, Abu-Sharif: Shamir Speech 'Out of Place'

Shamir's 'Sick Dreams'

JN3110210091 Paris Radio Monte Carlo in Arabic 2010 GMT 31 Oct 91

[From the "Panorama" program]

[Excerpts] PLO Chairman Yasir 'Arafat has wasted no time in replying to Shamir's speech at the Madrid conference. Responding to a question posed by colleague Widad 'Alam-al-Din, he said:

[Begin 'Arafat recording] As we expected, Shamir has come with his sick dreams and anachronistic and out-of-place ideas about the world, particularly about the world following the end of the cold war and the changes that have occurred, and about the importance of peoples' right to self-determination. This is just what happened in the Baltic states, and what has happened and is happening at the peace conference on Cambodia—Cambodia is now enjoying a new peace following long wars that have exhausted it—and just like the talks that are currently taking place between de Klerk and Nelson Mandela to create a new situation in South Africa free of racial discrimination, coercion, and injustice from which the South African people have suffered. After all this, Shamir comes to once again present his sick and strange ideas through which he wants to delude the world by his lies. He even knows that his historical reviews are lies, lies, and lies. [passage omitted]

As I have said, this speech is anachronistic and out of place. Shamir is one of the chronic cases [preceding two words in English], one of the diseases that exist during times of crises and cold and hot wars. [end recording]

'Old Rhetoric' Scored

LD0111100991 Paris France-Inter Radio Network in French 0700 GMT 1 Nov 91

[Statement by Bassam Abu-Sharif, Yasir 'Arafat's political adviser, on the Israeli stand; place and date not given—recorded]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] Shamir was out of place and out of time. The new world order, Bush's declaration, Baker's initiative, all these efforts have been totally forgotten by Shamir. He has given us old rhetoric which does not help to settle the Middle East problems. He insists on continuing the occupation of the occupied territories, and, as if this is not enough, he also insists on claiming the possession of these territories. [passage omitted]

Abu-Sharif Interviewed on Palestinian Stance

PM3110130191 London AL-HAYAH in Arabic 30 Oct 91 p 5

[Interview with Bassam Abu-Sharif, "adviser to Palestinian President Yasir 'Arafat," by Mazin al-Saghir in Tunis; date not given]

[Text] [Al-Saghir] Do you believe that the assurances submitted to you by some parties are sufficient for your participation in the peace conference?

[Abu-Sharif] The PLO decision to participate in the peace conference is an integral part of the constructive and flexible line which it has pursued since the beginning of the efforts aimed at securing a political settlement to the Middle East conflict. Our line takes into account that the Israeli Government does not want to implement the UN resolution concerning withdrawal from the occupied territories. Nor does it agree in principle to President Bush's initiative calling for the exchange of land for peace. Thus Palestinian participation in the peace conference is essentially based on that conference's being held on the foundations put forward by President Bush, and this is sufficient for initiating the negotiations.

[Al-Saghir] What are the points on which you insist with regard to the question of the borders with Israel?

[Abu-Sharif] In principle, Israel's withdrawal from all the territories it occupied in 1967 is the actual implementation of Security Council Resolution 242. But it is necessary to point out that the independent Palestinian state will comprise the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. And before 1967 there was no land or nonland (that is sea or air) link. But now it is necessary to link the two parts of the state. And this point is negotiable.

[Al-Saghir] What about the issue of the settlements in the West Bank?

[Abu-Sharif] A halt to building settlements is a necessary condition for the negotiations' success. And that is the first step toward dismantling these settlements and returning all the territories to their legitimate owners.

[Al-Saghir] And how do you visualize a solution to the question of the Palestinian communities (camps) in Syria, Lebanon, and Jordan?

[Abu-Sharif] The region is heading toward important demographic changes. The Palestinian people have set the aim of establishing a confederation between Palestine and Jordan. And undoubtedly such a confederation will be capable in the future of absorbing a large number of the Palestinians now living in camps in several Arab countries.

[Al-Saghir] Can that be regarded as a solution to the issue of the right to repatriation?

[Abu-Sharif] Every Palestinian will be entitled to return to his independent state, which we said would established on the territory of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip after their occupation ends.

[Al-Saghir] What are your assurances if no progress is made in the Arab-Israeli negotiations and the Palestinian-Israeli negotiations?

[Abu-Sharif] The Arab parties agreed at their meeting, held at the foreign minister level in Damascus, to participate in the peace conference provided that they coordinated their positions and did not allow the dilution of any point linked to ending Israel's occupation of all the Palestinian and Arab land.

[Al-Saghir] Some quarters believe that the PLO's role as a sponsor of the Palestinian delegation ends when negotiations begin.

[Abu-Sharif] The PLO is actually, not just in words, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. And every Palestinian belongs to it, because it symbolizes their national identity and national independence. It was the PLO which formed the Palestinian negotiating delegation. It is supervising it now and will in the future supervise all matters concerning the negotiations and the building of the independent state. Its role will not end as long as there is a role for the Palestinians. I believe it is clear to everyone that the Palestinians' role is fundamental to any peace process in the Middle East.

[Al-Saghir] Do you have assurances with regard to the PLO's participation in the second stage of negotiations?

[Abu-Sharif] The PLO participates in this stage through the Palestinian negotiating delegation. Its institutions' role is clear before the convening of the peace conference and will be clear both at and after the conference. It was the Palestine National Council which endorsed the decision to participate in the conference. And it was the Central Council which authorized the Executive Committee to choose the negotiating delegation. And the Executive Committee is the one following up the peace process.

[Al-Saghir] What is your understanding of the transitional period?

[Abu-Sharif] The transitional phase which will begin, as planned, a year after the peace conference commences will be a short phase after which the right to self-determination will be implemented physically and fully, that is national independence. We will propose that multinational forces replace the Israeli occupation forces during the transitional period. And if Israel rejects multinational forces, we will propose that they be replaced by U.S. forces.

[Al-Saghir] What about the steps that will follow the replacement of the Israeli forces by multinational or U.S. forces?

[Abu-Sharif] When these forces replace the Israeli occupation forces, free and democratic elections will be held. Every Palestinian will be entitled to nominate himself and vote. The first elections will be for the establishment of a unified Palestinian parliamentary council. It will be that council which will take the decision to start building the confederation with Jordan.

[Al-Saghir] Do you expect an imminent resumption of the U.S.-Palestinian dialogue? And will the dialogue resume after or before the second stage of negotiations?

[Abu-Sharif] We believe that President Bush and James Baker are serious in the endeavor to find a political settlement to the Middle East problem. This is why the PLO's positions have been and are still flexible and constructive. And I expect the U.S. dialogue with the PLO to resume before the end of the year, because there is no longer a reason for it to remain frozen.

Such direct contacts with the Palestinian leadership will contribute to resolving the problems which will certainly obstruct the negotiations' long and difficult road.

[Al-Saghir] What are your expectations with regard to the future of U.S.-Israeli relations in view of Tel Aviv's intransigence?

[Abu-Sharif] Undoubtedly the change taking place on the map of alliances at the world level will affect the alliances of the parties in the Middle East. And I expect further tension in the Israeli-U.S. relationship if the Israeli Government continues to refuse to comply with the UN resolutions. I also expect PLO-U.S. rapprochement in the light of the PLO's flexible and constructive positions. And undoubtedly that will prepare the atmosphere for strong PLO cooperation with the United States, and the PLO's relationship with it will be like the PLO's relationship with the Soviet Union.

[Al-Saghir] How do you visualize the form of the Palestinians' cooperation with the Israelis at the level of the economy, water, and the other aspects in the event of a settlement?

[Abu-Sharif] The general overview of the Middle East settlement does not only mean the return of the land to its owners in return for peace agreements; peace here also means normal relations, including cooperation on many issues like the water problem, the end of the boycott, Palestinian manpower, and so on. These will be subject to bilateral and multilateral negotiations under the heading of regional issues. All the Arab states will take part in these negotiations, down to a representative for the Gulf states and another for the Maghreb states.

'Abd-Rabbuh on PLO 'Message to World'

NC3110192891 London MBC Television in Arabic 1444 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Telephone interview with Yasir 'Abd-Rabbuh, identified as PLO Executive Committee member and leader of the Democratic Front, in Tunis by correspondent Mahir Shalabi in Madrid—live or recorded]

[Shalabi] Mr. Yasir 'Abd-Rabbuh, welcome to the MBC center. The first question is: What is the PLO's place in the ongoing peace negotiations in Madrid?

['Abd-Rabbuh] The PLO believes that the delegation participating in the Madrid conference is the delegation of the PLO and the Palestinian people. The delegation's speech is the PLO's and the Palestinian people's message to the world on comprehensive peace. The participating delegation in Madrid is the one carrying the issue of all the Palestine people: Their right to self-determination and to return to the homeland.

Palestinians today said what they want to say through Haydar 'Abd-al-Shafi, namely that peace will not be achieved except between the states of Jordan and Palestine. [sentence as heard] The bases for peace are the UN resolutions, starting with the partition resolution establishing two states in Palestine. Through the Palestinian delegation's speech, the PLO stressed on behalf of all Palestinian people that we will not relinquish a single inch of our territory, which has been guaranteed by UN resolutions since 1947.

[Shalabi] Mr. Yasir 'Abd-Rabbuh, do you expect direct Palestinian-Israeli negotiations? Will the PLO have a direct role in these future negotiations?

['Abd-Rabbuh] Today we heard Shamir's speech in which he called on Arab leaders to hold a direct meeting for negotiations on peace in the region. Shamir should have invited the Palestinian people's leadership to meet and have a dialogue because the conflict is basically a Palestinian-Israeli one. In return, the PLO calls on Shamir for a direct meeting between the two parties' delegations, between Yasir 'Arafat, leader of the Palestinian people and president of the state of Palestine, and the Israeli leadership. This is the shortest route to peace. The continuation of the Israeli policy of ignoring, as we heard from Shamir's speech, the Palestinian people's existence, rights, and the issue that has been the crux of the conflict for more than 40 years is the shortest route to failure for the peace conference.

[Shalabi] Mr. 'Abd-Rabbuh, how do you assess Arab-Palestinian and Arab-Arab coordination in the peace negotiations now in Madrid?

['Abd-Rabbuh] From the start, we in the PLO and the Democratic Front have called for the highest levels of coordination between all the parties participating in the peace conference, between the Palestinian delegation and the other brotherly Arab delegations. During our meeting in Damascus several days ago, which was attended by seven Arab countries, including representatives of Saudi Arabia and the Arab Maghreb, we agreed on comprehensive and constant coordination throughout the stages of the peace process. This coordination now exists and is constant. Following the opening sessions of the peace conference we are calling for a summit of the kings and presidents of the seven countries that attended the Damascus meeting to deepen and entrench this coordination and to have full agreement on the negotiations strategy, especially as it becomes clear from Shamir's speech that the Israeli stand has not changed at all. He rejects the principle of exchanging land for peace and withdrawal and refuses to halt settlements in the occupied Palestinian and Arab territories. As I said, coordination exists and it must be deepened through the summit we are calling for.

[Shalabi] Mr. 'Abd-Rabbuh, another question, this one on the U.S. stand: How does the PLO assess the U.S. stand?

['Abd-Rabbuh] We had hoped that the U.S. stand, as expressed by President Bush in his speech yesterday, would be more positive and that he would firmly clarify the same principles he declared in his speech to the U.S. Congress on 6 March. If the United States does not adhere to these principles and exert pressure to achieve them, then the peace process is doomed to failure, particularly in light of the intransigent Israeli stand denying the basis and essence of the conflict and refusing to deal with Palestinian rights as the beginning and the key for achieving peace. Consequently, we hold the United States responsible, a responsibility it has pledged to shoulder in the letter of assurances it gave to the Palestinian side during the preparatory negotiations to the peace conference. As I said, the U.S. stand we heard yesterday was not encouraging. But we expect the outlines of this stand to become clearer when the negotiations start, and we expect the United States to take a clear and firm stand on halting the settlements before the start of negotiations. This is essential, and no concessions will be made on this issue. We also expect the negotiations to be conducted on the bases that have been specified: the principle of land for peace, the Palestinian people's right to self-determination, and withdrawal from the occupied territories in accordance with Resolutions 242 and 338.

[Shalabi] The majority of the Palestinian people in the occupied territories support the peace process, but there is some opposition to this process. Part of this opposition was reported a short while ago. It was reported that some of the Democratic Front officials in the occupied territories have joined the Democratic Front you lead. Are these reports true?

['Abd-Rabbuh] A number of brothers who used to work with the other wing are now participating with us within the unified Palestinian delegation. They have asserted that their position is the same as the one the Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine committed itself to at the Central Council along with Fatah, the Palestinian Communist Party, and the other patriotic Palestinian figures. They commit themselves to participating in the peace process and in the Palestinian delegation according to the principles defined by the Palestine National Council [PNC] and the Central Council. We welcome these brothers in the ranks of the Democratic Front and within the unified Palestinian delegation that represents the Palestinian people, the PLO, and the Palestinian people's cause inside and outside the homeland. Despite the previous differences, we now believe that developments motivate us to close our ranks and take a unified stand behind the Palestinian delegation that upholds the Palestinian people's goals.

[Shalabi] The Palestinian delegate delivered his speech to the Madrid conference today. Certain people say that the Palestinian delegation has replaced the PLO. What is the PLO's response?

['Abd-Rabbuh] The whole world, including Shamir, the United States, and all the participants, know that the decision on the peace conference was made at the PNC and the decision on the Palestinian delegation's participation was made at the Central Council and that the formation of the Palestinian delegation was decided by the PLO leadership. It is high time that we declare this frankly and officially. This fact cannot be concealed and is crystal clear; the Palestinian delegate's speech to the conference affirmed this.

Attempts have been made to isolate the PLO from its people and to divide the Palestinian people. All these attempts have failed. Haydar 'Abd-al-Shafi, the loyal son of Palestine and its cause, spoke in the name of all the people. He dealt with the unified national cause of all the people inside and outside the homeland. The Palestinian people's speech delivered today by Haydar 'Abd-al-Shafi is a call for peace and for restoration of rights. As 'Abd-al-Shafi said in his speech, the world knows that the key to peace, normalization, and charting the future of the region on new bases begins with withdrawal from the occupied Palestinian and Arab territories, removal of the colonial settlements, and returning holy Jerusalem, capital of the Palestinian state, to its owners. Today, the Palestinians say before the world that the Palestinians in the camps of Gaza and in its towns and villages, in the camps and towns of the West Bank, in Jerusalem, in the diaspora, and in Madrid, we are one people, with one cause, and one representative, the PLO. I would like to reiterate that if the Israeli leaders want to choose the short and sound path to peace, they have to shake the hands extended to them by the Palestinians, the hand of the people, the hand of their leadership, the hand of the PLO, and the hand of Yasir 'Arafat.

[Shalabi] We thank you for this live interview.

['Abd-Rabbuh] Thank you and thanks to MBC television, which is playing a major and important role in broadcasting these events to the Palestinians, Arabs, and the world.

Qaddumi on Arab Coordination for Madrid Talks

LD3110191191 Algiers Voice of Palestine in Arabic 1702 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Interview with Faruq Qaddumi, head of the PLO Political Department, by unidentified Voice of Palestine correspondent; date, place not given; introduction by announcer—recorded]

[Text] [Announcer] Following his return from the five-sided meeting of the foreign ministers of the frontline [tawq] states in preparation for Arab coordination of the steps of the diplomatic conflict, which politically begins at the Madrid conference, Brother Abu-al-Lutf [Faruq Qaddumi], head of the PLO Political Department, commented on the proceedings of this sensitive meeting at this sensitive phase of events in the Arab region and the future of the Palestinian issue.

[Qaddumi] We visited Damascus. This was the first visit by Brother Abu-'Ammar [Yasir 'Arafat]. Thus, good relations have been restored between us and our brothers in Damascus. During this visit we discussed with the Syrian brothers the necessity of coordinating Arab stances. We had submitted to the Arab League proposals to convene meetings between the five states to agree on full coordination. Agreement was given to this decision. It was inevitable therefore to embark on immediate action to convene a speedy meeting in Damascus. Agreement was reached and we went to Amman where our Jordanian brothers also agreed [to attend], as did our Egyptian brothers when we visited Cairo. The aim of this meeting, as I said, was to coordinate fully between the stances of the five sides. These meetings were attended by His Highness Prince Sa'ud al-Faysal on behalf of the GCC [Gulf Cooperation Council], and Dr. Abdellatif

Filali on behalf of the AMU [Arab Maghreb Union]. At these meetings we issued a resolution on the necessity of coordination among the five delegations to review the proceedings of the conference and the talks and to make an appraisal of the progress made at these talks which may take place with any one of the five sides during the stages of the conference and subsequent talks. The ministers stressed continuation of the realization of the unity of the Arab stance to attain the aims for which the Arab side strives during the peace process.

In the forefront of these objectives comes Israeli withdrawal from all the occupied Arab territories, including Jerusalem, and an immediate halt to the building of settlements and safeguarding the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people.

Agreement was also reached among ourselves that the second stage of bilateral negotiations inside committees must end first before we come to the multilateral negotiations. This would mean one must realize a tangible accomplishment in the bilateral talks which confirms the removal of the basic obstacles along the path of peace. There must be a complete halt to settlements, the beginning of discussions on the status of Holy Jerusalem, and a start to the arrangements for withdrawal.

All agreed to these concepts and to the need to coordinate at each stage and evaluate the work of the previous stage and agree over our plan in the first stage.

[Correspondent] Brother Abu-al-Lutf: Can the conference continue its work in the shadow of the continuing building of settlements after this Arab coordination?

[Qaddumi] We cannot continue our work in the conference as long as there are intransigent attitudes on the part of Israel by rejecting the call for halting the building of settlements. The halting of building of settlements and an immediate halt to it are an essential matter because this is the basic obstacle in the way of the continuation of the work of the conference.

[Correspondent] What about linking the tangible results in the bilateral talks with the multilateral talks? Has agreement been reached on the linkage as a joint Arab condition?

[Qaddumi] We stressed and agreed to evaluate each stage of all the talks which take place with any of the five sides and agree over what we can do in the coming stage. This is the complete coordination between the five Arab sides. They are supported and backed on this by the AMU and the GCC.

Hamas Asserts Opposition to Madrid Conference

JN3110214591 Paris Radio Monte Carlo in Arabic 1950 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Interview with Engineer Ibrahim Ghawshah, official spokesman for the Islamic Resistance Movement, Hamas, by Salah Salamah and Widad 'Alam-al-Din on 31 October; place not given—live or recorded]

[Text] ['Alam-al-Din] It is well known that the Islamic Resistance Movement, Hamas, was almost the first among all forces to declare its opposition to the Madrid Middle East peace conference. What are the bases for your opposition to the conference?

[Ghawshah] Sister Widad, the Madrid conference is meant to conclude peace between the Arabs and the Palestinians, on the one hand, and the Jews on the other. We, as an Islamic Palestinian movement, believe that Palestine constitutes the heart for both the Arab and Islamic worlds. Moreover, we believe that it was occupied by aliens who came from overseas. Hence, from the start, we have refused to sit with the usurper enemy, who usurped this land. Furthermore, we believe that the Palestine question is the cause of all Muslims and the cause of the Al-Aqsa Mosque. We think that no one, whoever he may be, has the right to cede even a single inch of Palestinian territory. Similarly, we know Jews quite well. This knowledge was particularly granted to us by the Holy Koran. Behold, they give not a farthing to their fellowmen. [part of a Koranic verse] These people can never give anything, not even a square inch of Palestinian territory. What is actually being offered is the normalization of ties between the Arab states and Israel and autonomy for the Palestinians, neither more nor less. We have never heard that any people or nation ever relinquished its territory. We think that we are at the beginning of the road of jihad and martyrdom.

[Salamah] Engineer Ibrahim Ghawshah, as you are well aware, the Arab states and the PLO have affirmed the need to sound out the Israeli stands and the U.S. intentions in an effort to know whether it is possible to reach a comprehensive and just peace. In contrast, you have affirmed in advance that the Madrid conference itself is a loss to the Palestine question and to Arab rights as well. How do you explain this difference of opinion? Moreover, do you think that thwarting the Madrid conference must be achieved through democratic dialogue or by other means?

[Ghawshah] Brother, first, the Madrid conference was convened on the basis of certain clear foundations. All the conditions set by the Palestinians and Arabs were rejected by the Jews and the United States. The conference was convened in accordance with Jewish and Israeli conditions. Hence, the Arab and Palestinian delegations went to the conference while they were impotent. Shamir's position, which was articulated today, has confirmed our expectations, because we know the Jews quite well. Even with regard to settlements, they are not willing to halt their building for a single day so as not to create any doubt regarding their ownership of this land, as they claim. This is the Jewish position. Hence, our position has been clear, and events have come to confirm this. As for democratic dialogue, we were open-minded with the brothers within the PLO regarding the launching of a democratic dialogue and participation in the Palestine National Council [PNC] through democratic methods, either through elections or through a true representation of Palestinian forces in accordance with their real weight on the ground. However, they were adamantly opposed to this, they formed the PNC as they wished, and they sent a Palestinian delegation which they claimed represents the Palestinian people. As a matter of fact, this delegation only represents itself. Hence, the Palestinian people, who have confirmed their real stands today and yesterday in a general strike called for by Hamas and the other nine factions, scored a success. This strike was a referendum in the full sense of the word, showing that the Palestinian people oppose the Madrid conference.

['Alam-al-Din] So, you called for a general strike in the occupied territories. The news reports reaching us state that the response to the strike call was not as you expected. It was somewhat weak. Does this mean a lack of support for your demand that the conference be boycotted?

[Ghawshah] Sister, the strike was a success; however, there were attempts, regrettably from sisterly Fatah, which issued a statement on 29 October addressed to its supporters and urging them to break the strike. Here we would like to say that sabotaging the strike is a conspiracy aimed at breaking the intifadah. Hence, we hold those who issued instructions calling for breaking the strike fully responsible for all the consequences that could befall our Palestinian people. Moreover, we would like to affirm that the Muslim Palestinian people, supported by all Arab and Muslim peoples, oppose the Madrid conference and support the adoption of a militant and jihad position inside Palestine.

[Salamah] Engineer Ibrahim Ghawshah, it is clear the military confrontation option to regain the occupied Arab territories and restore the Palestinian national rights is out of the question at this point in time in light of the current military balance of power in the region. You demand that the peace negotiations be boycotted. Is it possible to maintain the no-war, no-peace situation, which is advantageous to Israel, as we all know? Moreover, what is the alternative, in your opinion?

[Ghawshah] First, we think the conflict between the Arabs and the Jews, between the Muslims and the Jews, is a cultural conflict that will continue raging throughout all time. If the Arab and Muslim nation is now at its lowest ebb, there are indications that there is an Arab-Islamic-Palestinian renaissance. The intifadah is a mere manifestation of this. This intifadah is on the verge of entering its fifth year. Our people are fighting, using all the power that they have. Besides, we would like to say that peoples before us struggled to regain their lands. Algeria fought for 130 years. Even the Baltic states, which were occupied by the Soviets, have had their independence recognized by world states 45 years after they were occupied. The Palestine question is only 40 years old, considering that it came into being in 1948. We are at the beginning of the road. Our adversary needs to be dealt with through a protracted and continuous confrontation. We have never heard that peoples can abandon their lands. We are particularly referring to the Palestinian people who fought the Balfour Declaration in 1917. They are fighting right now, and will continue their jihad and struggle.

[Salamah] Thank you Engineer Ibrahim Ghawshah, official spokesman for the Islamic Resistance Movement, for this interview.

[Ghawshah] Thank you, brother.

PFLP Leader Defends Resistance Methods

LD3110223791 Paris Antenne-2 Television Network in French 1900 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Text] [Announcer] The presence of a Palestinian delegation in Madrid is far from receiving unanimous support. It is thus that Georges Habash, leader of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine [PFLP], one of the components of the PLO that is hostile to Yasir 'Arafat, denounces a conference organized by Washington without the United Nations and without the PLO, at any rate officially. Georges Habash also justifies Palestinian violence, speaking to our special correspondent in Damascus, Isabelle Baechler.

[Begin recording] [Habash, in English with superimposed French translation] We will achieve our goal by struggle, our national struggle, resistance, as you did in France. We do not use violence. Why do you call it violence, why don't you call it resistance? We have every right to use such resistance, it is legitimate.

[Baechler] Well, when you kill a mother of seven children, all the same it looks like violence does it not?

[Habash] It is better for them leave our country, the West Bank. Then they will not suffer and we will not suffer.

[Baechler] Was it [28 October attack on bus carrying Israeli settlers] a local initiative or did you launch it?

[Habash] We leave it up to our members to assess what kind of action is possible and appropriate. [end recording]

[Announcer] We note that it was George Habash's PFLP which claimed responsibility for the attack carried out in the occupied West Bank on Monday against an Israeli bus which resulted in two dead and five injured.

Algeria

APS Comments on Madrid Peace Conference

LD3010123191 Algiers APS in English 1029 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Text] Madrid, 30 Oct (APS)—At last everything is ready to hold the peace conference on the Middle East whose three day works start today Wednesday in Madrid. Where efforts of delegations of countries concerned by Middle Eastern conflict, aimed at exerting influence on the conference's progress have already started. [sentence as received]

Front line Arab countries' ministers of foreign affairs met to endeavour to perfect the co-ordination of positions decided during their recent Damascus meeting.

Baker preferred to meet his Syrian counterpart without even waiting for the series of meetings scheduled at President Bush programme with the heads of delegations of the participating countries before the beginning of the conference.

Baker-al-Shar' meeting is regarded as a new U.S. attempt to relax Syria's position relatively considered to be hard since it still maintains its threat of not taking part in bilateral negotiations, U.S.'s prime concerns in the sense that they are decisive for the Arab-Israeli relations' normalization which is the first condition of the success of the U.S. security strategy in the Middle East.

Moreover, the Jordan-Palestinian delegation had already its say it stressed that it came to the conference with the firm resolution to act in favour of the instoration [as received] of a fair and overall peace in the Middle East "that will put end to our people's sufferings and achieve its national rights". "A peace backed up by UN resolutions and the international will".

Indeed, the Jordan-Palestinian came to "discuss fundamental matters such as the stoppage of Israeli colonies' settlements as an actual thwart for peace. [sentence as received]

Therefore, even if the conference remains formal since the main efforts serving peace will only start with November 12 multilateral and bilateral negotiations, it finds it difficult to reconcile between positions that are poles apart.

On the one hand, Israel hardening its tone and excluding any concessions regarding the occupied territories and on the other, PLO envisaging to carry on the fight till the achievement of the Palestinian people's national rights acknowledged by the international community through UN Security Council multiple resolutions.

It may be with a view to giving the conference a dynamic of real negotiations that the conference programme fully devoted the first day to the heads of delegations' interventions of countries that contributed to the holding of this meeting whatever was the degree of this contribution.

Bendjedid: Elections To Be 'Honest, Clean'

LD3110221191 Algiers Radio Algiers Network in Arabic 1830 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Text] The Algerian people are these days celebrating one of the greatest revolutions, the November generation revolution, namely the 37th anniversary of the outbreak of the glorious 1 November Revolution. On this occasion, President Chadli Bendjedid this morning at the Palais de Nations, at the Pine Club, gave a reception during which he received the greetings of the senior cadres of the state, the senior officers of the National People's Army; leaders of political parties and cultural and vocational societies; popular groupings, former members of the revolutionary council, and members of the diplomatic corps.

On this occasion the president of the Republic was surrounded by the speaker of the National People's Assembly, the prime minister, speaker of the Constitutional Council, and the ministers of defense and foreign affairs. He promoted nine senior officers of the National People's Army. Three were promoted to major general. They are: Ali Bouhadja, Larbi Belkheir, and Mohamed Alleg.

Also, six others were promoted to the rank of brigadier. They are: Noureddine Benkortbi, Chabane Ghodbane, Mohamed Taib Bourezzak, Belkacem Kadri, Rabeh Boughaba, and Mohamed Bekkouche.

President Chadli Bendjedid on the same occasion presented the Award of the President of the Republic for Arab Medicine to the Palestinian doctor 'Abd-al-'Aziz al-Labadi as a reward for his research into the history of Arab surgery. Arab ambassadors, the secretary general of the Algerian doctors association, and the three members of the awards panel were present.

During a dialogue with the invited guests, the president of the Republic said that no one can deny the achievements of the revolution, which restored honor, dignity, and sovereignty to the Algerian people, and that no one can engage in one-upmanship against others because the people know the truth of their history and the greatness of their revolution. The president of the Republic spoke at length on the question of democracy. He said it was the only way to emerge from the crisis. He called at the same time for the discarding of all methods which are against the spirit of Islam.

The president of the Republic reassured the leaders of political parties that the upcoming legislative elections will be honest and clean. The people will elect their representatives freely. He emphasized his desire that the state sees to it that conditions of stability and security will prevail for these elections which will produce a multiparty assembly that will entrench the democratic process.

Case Against FIS Official Hachani 'Unfounded'

LD2910165291 Algiers Radio Algiers Network in Arabic 1600 GMT 29 Oct 91

[Text] The national radio has learned from judicial sources that the Algiers court has issued a ruling in the case of Mr. Abdelkader Hachani, member of the Provisional Executive Bureau of the Islamic Salvation Front [FIS], stipulating that the case was unfounded. This final ruling was made today at 1535 [1435 GMT] this afternoon.

Hachani Released 30 Oct

LD3010144991 Algiers Radio Algiers Network in Arabic 0600 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Excerpt] Quoting solicitor Ali Yahia Abdennour, APS reports that Shaykh Abdelkader Hachani was released yesterday. [passage omitted]

'No Position' on FIS Role in Elections

LD3010112191 Algiers Radio Algiers Network in Arabic 0600 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Interview with Rabah Kebir, chairman of the political commission of the Provisional Executive Bureau of the Islamic Salvation Front, FIS, by correspondent Nacera Mennane in Algiers on 29 October—recorded]

[Text] [Announcer] Mr. Rabah Kebir, chairman of the political commission of the Provisional Executive Bureau of the Islamic Salvation Front [FIS], held a news conference at the meeting hall of the People's Council of the city of Algiers yesterday. In this news conference he covered a number of issues, among which was the upcoming legislative elections. Our colleague Nacera Mennane met Mr. Rabah Kebir on the sidelines of this news conference and asked him about the likelihood of the FIS' participation in the upcoming legislative elections. Mr. Rabah Kebir replied:

[Kebir] The FIS gave its instructions to our brothers in the provinces to prepare well for the legislative elections on a material as well as moral basis, to prepare the men who shoulder those responsibilities. No position has yet been adopted, however, with regard to the issue of participation in the elections themselves. This is not, as some media reported, because there is a divergence within the Ech Choura Council, but rather because the latter is convinced that the time for making the decision has not yet come but that it will be adopted in its time. The likelihood of our participation in the elections is equal to that of our nonparticipation in them. We will make the appropriate decision at a suitable time, taking into consideration all the existing political factors.

[Mennane] If the front decides not to participate in the legislative elections, will it give its votes to other parties in the second round?

[Kebir] If the Islamic Front boycotts the elections, we do not find justification for supporting another party, because if we boycott the elections it means we call on the Algerian people to boycott these elections, to make them fail if we consider them a falsification.

[Mennane] What is your stand toward the Consitutional Council's decision stipulating the unconstitutionality of Article 54 of the electoral law?

[Kebir] We say that this council has not yet adopted any stand that is in contradiction to whatever the president requests it to do—consequently, if this article is unconstitutional, then the previous elections are unconstitutional, and thus the president and his statements are unconstitutional.

[Mennane] What do you seek by organizing the march scheduled for next Friday?

[Kebir] We will affirm through the march that we are more entitled to follow November's principles, because they are Islam's principles, and with it we will demonstrate the tyranny and injustice that was caused to the Algerian people by the Algerian regime—it is similar to that caused by the French regime.

[Mennane] According to what is reported, according to my way of thinking the aim in organizing this march is to call for the release of Shaykh Abassi Madani and Shaykh Ali Benhadj. Is that not correct?

[Kebir] That is correct, because they are innocent, and the regime has admitted that those laws were unjust and that it should reconsider its decision and release the two cheikhs, because there is virtue in going back to the truth.

Islamic Rally Official Withdraws From Meeting

LD2810211691 Algiers Radio Algiers Network in Arabic 1900 GMT 28 Oct 91

[Excerpts] A consultative meeting between the Interior Ministry and the parties was held today at the Aurassi Hotel to discuss the technical matters of the legislative elections such as the organization of the election campaign and its financing. Djamal Nazzar reports:

[Nazzar] A consultative and technical meeting today to study ways to organize the legislative elections scheduled for 26 December brought together the Interior Ministry and the political parties. The day-long meeting enabled the Interior Ministry to listen to the interventions and suggestions of more than 40 political parties taking part in this meeting, in addition to the association of independent candidates. [passage omitted]

It is worth mentioning that the Arab Islamic Rally has attended the meeting with two delegation heads, and in the end Mr. Grine withdrew from this meeting at the outset of the proceedings.

[Begin Grine recording] Actually, we withdrew from this meeting because of the presence of Mr. Ali Zaghdoud's faction at the meeting. We consider our faction to be the legitimate faction because the congress held on 15 August 1991 in Constantine suspended Mr. Ali Zaghdoud's membership, and consequently the militant grass-roots of the party are dissatisfied with the presence of Mr. Ali Zaghdoud in this party. [end recording]

Islamic Rally Criticizes Council Decision

LD3010111591 Algiers Radio Algiers Network in Arabic 2200 GMT 29 Oct 91

[Text] In a statement which reached national radio this evening, the Islamic Rally Movement, Hamas, has termed the decision by the Constitutional Council as an attempt to abort the legislative elections and to disturb the situation. It is a gross challenge to the sentiments of the majority of the Muslim Algerian people for the sake of satisfying a minority, and it is a stab intended to exclude the Islamic parties from active and comprehensive participation. The Hamas movement sees a need to turn to a public referendum when solutions are difficult.

Relatives of French 'Harkis' Rehabilitated

LD3010222891 Paris Radio France International in French 0630 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Text] [Announcer] The Algerian justice minister announced yesterday that sons of harkis [Algerians who fought with the French in the Algerian war] will be able to stand in the elections and compete for deputy posts. [Journalist] Farida Ayari, from now on the sons of harkis will no longer be considered the outcasts of Algerian society.

[Ayari] No, the harkis' sons—history's forgotten ones on both sides of the Mediterranean—are in the process of being rehabilitated. If they wish, they will be able to make a political career in Algeria, the land of their ancestors. The justice minister announced this yesterday during a meeting with about 40 political parties to prepare for the legislative elections to be held on 26 December. Hamdani Benkhellil is the first Algerian official to publicly defend not only the right to vote of the sons of harkis but also their eligibility for deputies' seats. The justice minister believes, and I am quoting him, that the law is clear on this matter, as are the conditions of eligibility. The sons of harkis are not responsible for the wrongdoings of their parents, end quote. One should point out that Algerian law prevents any person who opposed the revolution from taking part in elections, but it openly applies to those who enlisted in the French Army during the period of colonization and the Algerian war. Harkis currently represent a community of nearly 500,000 French Muslims in France.

Sudan

Foreign Minister on 'Official Stance' on Conference

EA3110194091 Khartoum SUNA in English 1656 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Text] Khartoum, 31 October (SUNA)—The official stance towards the Madrid Conference on the Palestinian cause should be interpreted as a call for a fair peace for the Muslim people of Palestine rather than a stance against the peace efforts exerted in this regard, announced Foreign Minister 'Ali Ahmad Sahlul.

The minister's announcement came during his receiving here Thursday a protest memorandum delivered by a delegation representing a huge popular procession opposing the convening of the Madrid Conference.

Sahlul stressed that Sudan will not accept from that conference anything less than imposing a total withdrawal for the Israeli troops from the Arab occupied lands. He affirmed that no bargaining would be made on the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people on establishing their independent state and there would be no procrastination on al-Quds status as the eternal capital of Palestine. The minister affirmed that Sudan is more keen to protect the interests of the Islamic and Arab nations.

Addressing the delegation, the minister said the anti-Madrid Conference demonstration stood a clear evidence that the flame of struggle is still kindling inside the hearts of the Arab Muslim peoples who are at maximum alert to defend at any time the interests of the Arab Muslim nation.

In the memorandum which was addressed to the Madrid Conference the popular organisation for supporting peoples expressed the condemnation and rejection of the Sudanese people to the bases of the Madrid Conference and referred to the U.N. resolutions on the Palestinian cause which are still remaining unimplemented. In its memo, which will be conveyed to the Conference by the Sudan's ambassador in Spain, the organisation stressed that the Arab and Muslim nations would accept nothing but a total pull-out of Israel from the Palestinian occupied Arab territories and the establishment of an independent Palestinian state. It affirmed full rejection to the Conference's resolutions that will not meet the aspirations of the Muslim nations.

SPLA Official Views Postponed Peace Talks

AB2410152591 London BBC World Service in English 0630 GMT 24 Oct 91

[From the "Network Africa" program hosted by Neil Curry]

[Text] Now, as you probably heard in the news, peace talks due to have started in Nigeria on Monday, 28 October, between the Sudanese Government and the Sudan People's Liberation Army [SPLA], actually failed to get off the ground. The OAU and the United Nations had brokered the talks, but in the end they were postponed, apparently to allow the SPLA to try to sort out their internal problems. You may remember last month that news emerged of opposition to SPLM [Sudan People's Liberation Movement] leader John Garang by a breakaway group of commanders. One of those breakaways was Lam Akol, secretary for internal affairs and peace in the interim executive committee of the organization. He had been expecting to be going to the meeting in Abuja. Well, he is in Nairobi now, so I called him by phone and asked what he thought of the stalled talks.

[Begin recording] [Akol] Well the talk did not go ahead because it seems that it was not properly prepared for in advance. When the preparations were being made and arrangements were under way, the SPLA leadership and the rank and file knew nothing about what was supposed to be discussed in Abuja, so I think that if they had postponed it for more consultations it would stand a better chance of reaching an agreement.

[Curry] By that do you mean more consultations with the SPLM?

[Akol] No, more consultations between the mediator and other parties involved in the conflict in Sudan.

[Curry] But we know of this split that had emerged within the SPLM, and so it has just complicated the situation. Is it really possible for the SPLM to actually set themselves a specific agenda for these talks?

[Akol] The so-called split with the SPLA is not going to be a long-term thing. It is temporary. What has happened is that a process has been started to remove John Garang from the leadership of the movement. He is trying to resist that, but there is no way he can, so sooner or later, he will not be there in the leadership of the movement.

[Curry] But it was Mr. Garang who was due to be representing the SPLM at these talks on Monday.

[Akol] But by that time, the time when the preparations were made, he was the leader of the movement. Right now, he is not so, I do not think he will be there in the next meeting.

[Curry] So, who do you think will be representing the movement at the next meeting?

[Akol]) Well, the new SPLA leadership under the command of Commander Riek Mieshar.

[Curry] Now, apart from what you are saying about the way that the leadership seems to be developing from your point of view, we have a news story this morning that John Garang himself is reported to be urging his forces to prepare to take the fight into the north of Sudan. That does not sound like the word of somebody who is prepared to step down.

[Akol] Well, actually when he has talked about taking the war to the north, it is not to fight enemies; it is to fight us, because he has tried to turn his forces to Bau, and then the soldiers were deserting, they did not see any reason why they should be fighting us when we were representing their grievances and their points of view. So, this appeal from him is a desperate appeal in order to deceive them into going northward in the belief that they were going to fight enemy, but this again will fail.

[Curry] Mr. Akol, quite frankly, it does not sound like a very positive atmosphere for peace talks to be going ahead.

[(Akol] Well, maybe this is what the organizers considered, I mean, we worked to resolve the issue peacefully. Garang is bent on fighting [words indistinct]. He had tried it but he is getting beaten on the [word indistinct]. So, I do not see how a peace talk can be made while we are still at (?loggerheads).

[Curry] So, just (?tell me) Mr. Akol, how do you see this situation being resolved ideally from your point of view?

[Akol] Ideally, well some friends offer their good offices to mediate between us and John Garang, and this is why I am here in Nairobi. I have been here now for three weeks. Nobody turned up from the (?other side). So, it shows that they were not ready for a peaceful resolution, because they well know that the resolution of the problem will lie in the democratization of the movement and the release of political prisoners, issues that they do not want to contemplate. [end recording]

Government Emphasizes Readiness To Negotiate

EA2410172291 Khartoum SUNA in English 0920 GMT 24 Oct 91

[Text] Khartoum, 24th October (SUNA)—Sudan has renewed its readiness to negotiate with the rebellion movement at any time and in any place to realise peace in the country, indicating that its programme for a justice and comprehensive peace was prepared two years ago.

Member of the RCC [Revolution Command Council] and chairman of the peace and external relations department, Col Muhammad al-Amin Khalifah, said that the current split in the rebellion movement would not help to reach the lasting and comprehensive solution which the government is working for.

In a statement to the daily AL-SUDAN AL-HADITH of today, Col Khalifah said that the current split in the rebellion movement reminded us of the Addis Ababa 1972 peace agreement between the then President Ja'far Numayri and the Anyanya I Movement chaired by Joseph Lagu, pointing to the emergence of the Anyanya II Movement and the current rebellion movement despite the said agreement.

A successful agreement for the sake of peace in the south of the Sudan must be based on the real representation of southerners inside and outside the Sudan, Khalifah stressed. Col Khalifah was commenting on recent reports from Lagos, Nigeria, that the Nigerian-sponsored peace negotiations between the Sudanese Government and the outlaws were postponed for a month.

Commentary on Talks With Rebels

EA2910095291 Omdurman Sudan Broadcasting Service Network in Arabic 1315 GMT 27 Oct 91

[Station commentary]

[Text] Peace discussions between the government and the rebel movement were supposed to begin tomorrow in the Nigerian capital, Abuja, under the auspices of President Ibrahim Babangida, to put an end to the current civil war in the beloved south of the country, to which a large number of the sons of our homeland—irrespective of whether they were soldiers in the Armed Forces or civilians, namely children, women and old people—have fallen victim.

The Government of Nigeria has announced a postponement of these discussions for a complete month. The Nigerian authorities have heaped the blame on the rebel movement that has been diminished by the current conflict within its ranks, and the recent split within it. The movement forgets that each day in which fighting continues, and (?any action) that does (?not) lead to the achievement of peace, whatever its justifications, represents an unpardonable crime against the Sudanese people.

The slogans being raised by the rebel movement for the liberation of Sudan have all fallen. Hence, it is worthier for it to liberate itself from its illusions, ambitions, and conflicts that prevented it from working in the government to settle the problems [words indistinct] so that the citizens of the south, before others, enjoy a decent life. [passage indistinct]

Let the movement know that the ball is now in its court, since the government has made all its preparations and drawn up a specific program for negotiation with the rebel movement and for achieving peace.

The truth is that the National Salvation Revolution has adopted the recommendations of the national conference on peace issues, which lay down a clear concept to deal with the country's chronic problems and pending issues, namely, cultural diversity, ethnic differences, the sharing of power, and the equal distribution of wealth.

The application of federal rule as a system of government of a country of this diversity is perhaps the greatest bold step by which the National Salvation Revolution overcame the accumulations of years and maladies of the past. The revolution has made far-reaching strides in implementing the federal system according to the plan drawn up by the conference, and the aims of the stage which it specified. Indeed it laid down the framework and laws for completing this system.

Perhaps this system is what the southern leadership have been calling for since the Juba Conference of 1947, and it has been a dream throughout this period, until the national conference on peace issues approved it and the National Salvation Revolution adopted it. This confirms the magnanimity of this revolution, its patience, and its understanding of the southern problem and its dimensions.

We hail the efforts of the revolution and its eagerness to achieve peace and stability. For the sake of peace and stability, the National Salvation Revolution is prepared to sit today, before tomorrow, for negotiations with the movement anywhere. That was the motive for accepting the mediation of President Babangida.

The movement should now come to the negotiations with a clear concept and a specific program so that it controls itself and (?others for) dialogue, and so that it does not find another justification for the postponement of the negotiations without taking into account the circumstances of the citizens and their suffering. Undoubtedly, if the movement drops narrow interests, and rises above trivialities and resorts to reason, logic, and objectivity, we will achieve what we aim at; namely, security, stability, and peace, God willing.

Army Takeover Urged Before 'Purge' Completed

EA2410155091 (Clandestine) Radio of the Sudanese People's Liberation Army in English 1300 GMT 23 Oct 91

[Text] Now here is an article headlined: Islamic Fundamentalists Almost Complete Army Purge. [passage indistinct] The Islamic fundamentalist junta in Sudan has [word indistinct] completed the purge of the Sudanese Armed Forces. Figures [word indistinct] are available to show that at least 3,000 officers have either been [words indistinct] or dismissed. This number does not include NCO's and men, of whom tens of thousands fall into the same four categories of execution, imprisonment, detention, or dismissal, and the picture is worse in the civil service where even larger numbers have lost their jobs.

These statistics for dismissed officers in the Sudanese Armed Forces were recently given in a lengthy report by the legitimate commanders of the national army. They also warned that unless the national army and the general public do something very soon to overthrow the present regime, the total dismemberment and (?extinction) of the Sudanese Army will be completed. It will have to be replaced by a fundamentalist army manned by fanatic Islamic militias. Although the militias are fast gaining ground [words indistinct] it is not yet too late. The Sudanese Armed Forces are still capable of overthrowing the regime and they should move to do so with the help of the Sudanese people.

The legitimate commanders of the national army report that since June 1989, when the present Islamic military junta seized power, at least 28 officers have been executed, more than 30 sentenced to long terms of imprisonment, more than 200 kept under detention without charge or trial, and nearly 200 dismissed. These numbers exclude the thousands of officers and men who are now isolated from the rest of the Army and are facing courts-martial because they were defeated on the battlefield in southern Sudan.

Most of these [word indistinct] officers and men, who were repatriated to southern Sudan from neighboring countries where they sought refuge after their garrisons were overrun by the SPLA [Sudanese People's Liberation Army], are now held in what is virtually a concentration camp at Jabal Awliya outside Khartoum. At least one of the officers in this group has already committed suicide after being put on trial for [words indistinct] returning from fighting to defend what he thought was the honor of his country and army [words indistinct] in the south.

The legitimate commanders report that during last August the purge within the army was continuing with seven major-generals, six brigadiers, and (?14) lower-ranking officers being dismissed. In addition, 163 other commissioned officers were arrested and an unspecified number of NCO's and men were also dismissed or detained. [Words indistinct] government has recruited nearly 700 Islamic fundamentalist troops known as the Islamic youth brigade, or [word indistinct], in the officers' corps. The recruitment of Islamic religion [as heard] to form the bulk of the fundamentalist defense force [words indistinct] throughout the country. Meanwhile, those Army officers whose allegiance to the Islamic fundamentalist force is doubted are being transferred to the southern parts of the Sudan to face the SPLA as a way of their punishment.

Al-Bashir Addresses Ethiopian Representatives

EA2410194391 Khartoum SUNA in English 1622 GMT 24 Oct 91

[Text] Addis Ababa, 24th October (SUNA)—Chairman of the RCC [Revolution Command Council], the premier, Lt-Gen Umar al-Bashir, has affirmed Sudan's unswerving stance on non-interference in domestic affairs of neighbouring Ethiopia. Addressing here Thursday [24 October] the Ethiopian House of Representatives, or "parliament," Gen al-Bashir stressed that his stance is a confirmation to Sudan's rejection of others' intervention in its internal affairs.

Gen al-Bashir, in his address, also affirmed Sudan's full respect to the options, whatsoever, of the Ethiopian peoples.

"We are looking forward for channels of dialogue to be established between the National Council in Sudan and the Ethiopian House of Representatives for mapping out future plans on consolidating the brotherly relations and boosting stability in the two countries," said Gen al-Bashir. He cited the already- established joint committee between the two countries as constituting a good ground for consultations and cooperation.

Gen al-Bashir pointed out that Sudan had applied the federal system of rule for realising the principle of power-sharing, the fair distribution of wealth and unity in diversity.

Gen al-Bashir said that Ethiopia is aware of the responsibility of overcoming fanaticism and ethnicism to pave the way for entering the era of prosperity after it had scored its glorious victory, which is considered a victory for all peace-loving countries.

The session of the Ethiopian House of Representatives was attended by president of the Ethiopian interim government and speaker of the Ethiopian House of Representation, Meles Zenawi.

Returns From Addis Ababa

EA2510155091 Omdurman Sudan Broadcasting Service Network in Arabic 1700 GMT 24 Oct 91

[Text] Lieutenant General 'Umar Hasan Ahmad al-Bashir, chairman of the Revolution Command Council and the Council of Ministers, along with the delegation accompanying him, returned home this evening. [Words indistinct] and his excellency the head of the judiciary, and a number of their excellencies the ministers. [passage indistinct]

[Begin al-Bashir recording] [Words indistinct] on invitation to visit Ethiopia in order to acquaint ourselves with the situation in that country after [words indistinct]. The delegation was warmly received by the government and the people of Ethiopia and we held very successful meetings with the brothers and (?sisters) in Ethiopia. We concluded an agreement on economic, political, cultural, and (?development) cooperation. The visit was successful on all counts. We acquainted ourselves with the situation in Ethiopia after the changes there, and I can say that our views were identical on all issues of mutual concern. God willing, we will form a joint ministerial committee in November to draw up a detailed agreement to codify all that was decided upon. [end recording]

Economic Cooperation Accord Signed With Romania

EA2510221491 Khartoum SUNA in English 0930 GMT 25 Oct 91

[Text] Khartoum, 25 Oct (SUNA)—Sudan and Romania have agreed to promote the economic cooperation between them on all domains, a reliable source at the Finance Ministry announced. The source indicated that the agreement was reached in a meeting held here Thursday [24 October] between the finance minister, Dr. 'Abd-al- Rahim Hamdi, and the visiting Romanian delegation. The two sides have reviewed spheres of the economic cooperation and agreed to hold another meeting during next year, the source said. The Romanian delegation arrived here recently on a several-day visit to Sudan to discuss the Sudanese-Romanian economic cooperation.

Darfur State To Become Demilitarized Zone

EA2610134591 Khartoum SUNA in English 1632 GMT 25 Oct 91

[Text] Khartoum, 25 October (SUNA)—The state of Darfur (western Sudan) will be declared at the end of December as a demilitarized zone following the crushing of armed robbery gangs and collection of the unlicensed weapons, the prefect of Kutum Province (northern Darfur) said. Col Mahjub Hamzah pointed out, in a press statement, that the move comes in the context of the plan implemented by the government to restore stability in the state. He described the arms collection plan in the state as "successful," pointing to the implementation of the first phase during which big numbers of armed robbery bands had been crushed. He concluded that more than 20,000 pieces of arms were surrendered by the citizens to the concerned authorities in the state. Regarding the steps that will be taken during the second stage, currently under way, the prefect said that a list including the quantities of unregistered weapons will be presented by men of local administration, pointing out that 25th of next November was set as the deadline for submitting those lists. Col Hamzah explained that the third phase will begin in November, during which any person at the state will be obliged to hand over his arms to the nearest police or military station. He said that the security forces had recaptured 2,000 head of cattle stolen by the armed robbers.

Bahrain

Khalifah, UK's Hogg Voice Support for Peace

JN2910153791 Manama WAKH in Arabic 1305 GMT 29 Oct 91

[Excerpt] Manama, 29 Oct (WAKH)—Bahrain's Foreign Minister Shaykh Muhammand Bin-Mubarak Al Khalifah conferred here today with Douglas Hogg, British minister of state for foreign affairs, who is currently visiting Bahrain.

Discussions dealt with bilateral relations between the State of Bahrain and the United Kingdom and ways of developing cooperation between the two countries in various fields. Discussions also dealt with the situation in the Gulf region and the peace conference due to be held in Madrid tomorrow, Wednesday, with the aim of reaching a solution to the Middle East problem and the Palestine question. The two sides voiced support for the start of the peace process in the region. [passage omitted]

Kuwait

Foreign Minister States Support for Palestinians

LD3110153591 London KUNA in Arabic 1330 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Excerpt] Kuwait, 31 Oct (KUNA)—The Kuwaiti deputy prime minister and minister of foreign affairs, Shaykh Salim al-Sabah, affirmed that the Palestinian cause was the central and main issue in the Middle East region and reiterated Kuwait's support for the Palestinian people in order to recover their land and establish their country on it.

This was said when Shaykh Salim al-Sabah received here today a group of journalists from India, on the occasion of their visit to Kuwait to acquaint themselves with the huge destruction caused by the Iraqi occupation forces to the infrastructure in Kuwait, particularly the oil fires which were lit by these forces when they were repelled from Kuwait last February.

The Kuwaiti deputy prime minister and foreign minister pointed out during his talk to the Indian information delegation that Kuwait stressed the necessity to implement UN Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338, which relate to the Palestinian issue and give to the Palestinian people the right to establish their independent homeland.

Shaykh Salim al-Sabah also said: "Our support for the Palestinian cause and the Palestinian people is based on many principles, and the shameful stance of the PLO leadership which supported the Iraqi occupation of Kuwait has not affected it." [passage omitted]

Amir Receives Fijian, ICRC Presidents

NC2910165391 Kuwait Radio Kuwait in Arabic 1000 GMT 29 Oct 91

[Text] Fijian President His Excellency Ratu Penaia Ganilau visited his highness the amir at the al-Bayan Palace at 1000 this morning. The meeting was attended by His Highness Shaykh Sa'd al-'Abdallah al-Salim al-Sabah, heir apparent and prime minister; Shaykh Nasir Muhammad al-Ahmad, minister of Amiri court affairs; and Muhammad Sulayman Sayyid 'Ali [word indistinct], adviser to the amir.

At 1030 this morning, the amir received Cornelio Sommaruga president of the International Committee of the Red Cross [ICRC]. Ghazi 'Ubayd al-Sammar, justice minister and head of the national committee in charge of prisoners and missing persons; 'Abd-al-'Aziz al-Dakhil, under secretary of the ministry of justice; and Dr. Badr [name indistinct], head of the executive bureau in charge of prisoners and missing persons, were present.

Qatar

Amir Views Cooperation With UK Secretary Hogg

JN3010113691 Manama WAKH in Arabic 1030 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Text] Doha, 30 Oct (WAKH)—Qatari Amir His Highness Khalifah Bin-Hamad Al Thani today received Douglas Hogg, British secretary of state for foreign affairs, who is currently visiting Doha.

The QATARI NEWS AGENCY says that during the meeting, which was attended by the Qatari defense minister, the two sides discussed the situation in the Gulf region in the wake of last year's events, and the means to entrench security and stability in this vital region of the world. They also discussed positive developments in the process of achieving a durable and comprehensive peace in the Middle East, represented by the Madrid conference, and the role of Britain and the EC in peace efforts, in addition to bilateral relations.

Hogg Stresses Support for GCC States

JN3110193591 Manama WAKH in English 1630 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Text] Doha, Oct. 31 (GNA)—The British Minister of State for Foreign Affairs Mr. Douglas Hogg left Doha today following a two day visit to Qatar as part of a regional tour.

Hogg told a news conference before his departure that the British Government is willing to take its part in reinforcing and supporting the efforts of the GCC [Gulf Cooperation Council] countries in maintaining their security. Equally important is that the responsibility for collective defence has to remain with the GCC countries.

But in terms of exercises, and training and supply of equipment, Britain can reinforce what the Gulf states are in a position to do, he said.

He said Britain attaches enormous importance to the Madrid peace conference and believes that the meeting is a historic ster. [as received] Even if the conference comes to an early end, it will have affected the public opinion in Israel and set a precedent in direct negotiations among the parties concerned, he added.

"We believe that the Israelis have got to negotiate with the Palestinians on the Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338. We do not think there is any agreement possible with the Palestinians that does not make provision for political rights [word indistinct] the Palestinians and land with which to make reality of those rights. We think [indistinct word] if there is an agreement with Palestinians that Israel can hope to secure an agreement with the Arab states", Hogg said.

[Words indistinct] he said and added U.S. Secretary of State James Baker deserves a great deal of credit for what he has done to bring together the parties of the Middle East conflict around the negotiating table. Britain is reinforcing and supporting what the United States is doing, Hogg noted. "We have a role to play at the margin but do not pretend that were at the center to drive [word indistinct] added.

Saudi Arabia

King Fahd Affirms Support for Madrid Conference

LD3010145291 Riyadh Saudi Arabian Kingdom Radio Network in Arabic 1130 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Interview with Saudi King Fahd Bin-'Abd-al-'Aziz Al Sa'ud by UKAZ newspaper chief editor on the Madrid peace conference on 30 October; place not given—recorded]

[Text] The custodian of the two holy mosques said that the clear determination of the international community—and more precisely that of President George Bush and President Mikhail Gorbachev and efforts made by U.S. Secretary of State James Baker, as well as the Arab leaders—with regard to the necessity of ending the conflict and consecrating the causes of security, stabilility, and cooperation between everybody, makes us, more than ever before, less pessimistic. He added that the stubborn Israeli stands did not prevent one from making more exhausting efforts to complete cooperation in order to impose the will of peace, right, and justice until the Palestinian people recover their legitimate rights. He said that it was unnatural that the world would move toward security, peace, stability, and cooperation under the aegis of the new world order while our region remained a permanent hotbed of tension.

The custodian of the two holy mosques pointed out that the world was looking forward to the start of the first round of negotiations for laying down serious, acceptable, and encouraging bases for continuing constructive dialogue. He said that full cooperation and coordination between the Arab community is liable to achieve the planned aims, entering the peace process at present, since suitable conditions were made available.

The custodian of the two holy mosques ended his interview saying: What we want and look forward to are sincere intentions for making these negotiations successful, then the leaders of the Arab nations would prove that they were preachers of peace and love and that they wanted to establish the state of peace with Israel without neglecting their legitimate and just rights. He wished the conference success and said that the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia stood with all its potentialities behind every progress, achieved by the negotiators, which can return the rights to those entitled to them and safeguard our region from the calamities of war and destruction.

Yemen

President Salih on Madrid, Unity, Gulf War

PM2910160191 London AL-QUDS AL-'ARABI in Arabic 25 Oct 91 p 4

[Interview with Yemeni President 'Ali 'Abdallah Salih by Bilal al-Hasan in Sanaa; date not given]

[Excerpts] [Al-Hasan] Your Excellency Mr. President, how do you view the present peace process, and what is your advice to the Palestinians in that connection?

[Salih] We are following all the steps and efforts made to convene the peace conference which the United States is seeking to convene. And we in Yemen are for convening a peace conference that achieves a comprehensive, just, and lasting peace in the region by resolving the Palestinian issue and ending the Arab-Israeli dispute. It regrettable to see the Arab brothers going to the peace conference in Madrid to sit at the negotiating table with the Israelis without the existence of anything agreed beforehand and without any conditions. And we do not know whether the Arabs will go to that conference on the basis of the Arab summit resolutions, the Islamic summit resolutions, or the UN resolutions. And if we look attentively, we will find that the Camp David conditions were better than the conditions for participation in this conference. The question is: If we rejected the Camp David conditions for achieving peace between the Arabs and the Zionists, how can we accept the new conditions? The truth is that the present Arab reality has deteriorated, especially following the results of the Gulf war, as a result of the fragmentation of the Arab position. This is why the Zionists could dictate their conditions and why some people had to accept them, despite knowing that they are unjust with regard to the Palestinian people and the Arab nation. But it seems that every party has the impression that it is the winner, and we do not know what the results will be in the future. Leaving that conference—if it convenes—without arriving at results capable of guaranteeing the achievement of a just peace would result in very serious consequences for the Arab nation and the Palestinian cause in particular. And the loss will be bigger for those who worked and arranged for convening that conference. Despite this, we in Yemen hope that the peace conference will be held on time and will be a conference of peace, not of Arab capitulation. [passage omitted]

[Al-Hasan] Mr. President, we notice that while the nation faces this problem, Iraq continues to suffer from the economic blockade imposed on it. Do you believe that that blockade is part of the war that took place, or have matters gone beyond that?

[Salih] The continuation of the blockade imposed on Iraq now is outside the Security Council resolutions. The blockade is being imposed outside those resolutions. In fact talking about linking the lifting of the blockade represents blatant interference in Iraq's internal affairs. It is regrettable to see the leaders of some Arab and Islamic states paying no attention to their brothers' appeals for help. There is an entire Arab, Muslim people being exposed to the predicament of starvation, disease, and food and medicine shortages. In fact those brothers did not hesitate to openly demand the continuation of the economic blockade against the Iraqi people, as happened at the Islamic states foreign ministers' meeting in Istanbul—a position which is not in line with the spirit of brotherhood, Islamic values, or the values of humanity and justice. We hope that the international community will view the Iraqi people's suffering under the blockade in a humane spirit.

[Al-Hasan] Brother President, besides Iraq, Yemen, too, was affected by the Gulf war and its results, especially in terms of the expulsion of many Yemeni workers and expatriates from more than one Gulf country, in particular the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. How do you assess the Yemeni position on the Gulf war? And do you regret it? And how will you overcome the effects and results of that war and your position on it?

[Salih] The Yemeni position on the Gulf crisis was clear and principled, and we were content to endure its consequences. We are convinced of our position because it is the correct position, and the day will come when everyone will reexamine his accounts in a correct and objective way, without emotions or convulsions. And then it will be known who was wrong and who was right. We in Yemen repeated that on more than one occasion. We condemned Iraq's invasion and occupation of Kuwait. And we rejected the foreign presence in the region. We were the advocates of an Arab solution. That was our position on the crisis, but despite that we were subjected to a blockade. [passage omitted]

[Al-Hasan] Mr. President, a period has elapsed since the achievement of unity. Are you satisfied with the actual merger steps?

[Salih] We are satisfied with all that has been achieved in process of the merger of establishments and organs. And before all that we are very satisfied and happy with what has been achieved with regard to the reachievement of the Yemeni homeland's unity, the unification of the Yemeni family, the ending of two systems, and the establishment of a new democratic system in the Arabian peninsula. The merger process has been conducted in an excellent way, and we are in the process of completing the merger of the remaining establishments, which are few. Generally, we are satisfied and happy with what has been achieved. [passage omitted]

[Al-Hasan] Your Excellency, abroad there is talk about security disturbances like the occurrence of assassinations and violent incidents in some governorates, or the incident which took place in Sanaa a few days ago. We would like an assessment of that question.

[Salih] In fact, the incidents and crimes which occurred in the two parts of Yemen before the unity took place were probably at the same level and scale as is happening now. But because of the absence of party and political pluralism no one talked about those incidents and crimes. Now, with party and media pluralism, these incidents have started to emerge, and they are exaggerated by some newspapers out of various motives, most importantly the search for sensationalism, although similar incidents which disrupt security occur in societies more developed than ours, like, for example, U.S. society. But they talk about it in a normal way without recourse to the sensationalism and exaggeration which some hostile forces are trying to exploit abroad and portray as a disruption of security and stability in the country.

We have emphasized on more than one occasion that we are committed to the democratic option and there will never be any backtracking on it, whatever the excesses of some people against democracy. In fact we will tackle the mistakes of democracy with more democracy. And at the same time we will not allow anyone to disrupt society's security, stability, and peace.

[Al-Hasan] Your Excellency, our final question is about the Arab blockade imposed against Yemen. On the other hand there is an opening up from the European states to your country. Do you accept that?

[Salih] First, there is no Arab blockade against Yemen. Our relations with the Arab states are good and we have no problems with any Arab states, except for some coolness in relations with some Gulf states as a result of theoe states' assessment of Yemen's position on the Gulf crisis. As for the other Arab states, our relations with them are normal and good. In fact no Arab state can impose a blockade against another Arab state, because the Arab homeland as a whole is besieged and all its states are seeking help from outside, since they have not yet secured its food, industrial, or even military needs. Everyone in the Arab homeland imports his food, machinery, and equipment from abroad. So no Arab state has the ability to impose a blockade against another Arab state, as we all import from abroad, and none of us is doing the others any favors.

Republican Guard Units Deployed Around Baghdad

LD2910215791 Tehran Voice of the Islamic Republic of Iran First Program Network in Persian 2030 GMT 29 Oct 91

[Excerpt] The Iraqi regime has stationed a large number of its Republican Guards units around Baghdad to strengthen its defense positions against possible attacks by popular forces on that city. According to the report of the Central News Unit, the Supreme Assembly of Islamic Revolution of Iraq, announcing the above, added that a number of Republican Guards units have been stationed at al-Mahmudiyah, a region 30 kilometers from Baghdad. [passage omitted]

National Assembly Condemns Madrid Conference

JN0111065791 Baghdad INA in Arabic 1955 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Text] Baghdad, 30 Oct (INA)—The National Assembly has condemned the convocation of the settlement conference in Madrid, and described it as a conspiracy against the Arab nation by which the United States aims at forcibly reconciling the Arab countries participating in the conference with the Zionist entity, without any real guarantees securing the Palestinian people's historic rights to their homeland.

In a statement issued today, the Assembly urged the masses of the Arab nation, headed by the people in the occupied territory, to reject all deceptive attempts and to continue and escalate their valiant intifadah. It also urged them to maintain their national unity; a unity which enabled them to fight against the Zionist occupation of the Arab territory, and to convey the voice of the Palestinian revolution to the conscience of all mankind through their intifadah.

On behalf of Iraqi and Arab people, the National Assembly urged our Arab Palestinian people inside and outside the occupied territory to adhere to the Palestinian Arab people's inalienable historic rights to their homeland, and to persevere and work seriously for the continuation and escalation of the popular intifadah. The Assembly also urged that the Palestinian Arab people's militant spirit and their national unity, which is the strong foundation for the achievement of their goals in liberating both land and man, be maintained.

The statement stressed that the Iraqi people, who expressed their firm position on different occasions and at various stages through their representatives at the popular and professional organizations, will continue to adhere to the Arabism of Palestine and the inalienable historical rights of the Palestinian Arabs, considering the PLO as their sole legitimate representative.

The National Assembly's statement said that Iraq's confrontation of the fiercest malicious imperialist conspiracy was for the sake of imposing a just and peaceful solution to the Palestine question that guarantees the Palestinian Arab people's right to their land and soil.

The statement added that the global forces of evil and the defeatist Arab regimes, represented by Egypt and Syria, have turned into a tool implementing the Zionist plan drawn up for the area by the United States and its allies. This plan seeks to undermine Iraq's capability and role in resisting this dirty conspiracy, it said.

The statement also urged the masses of the Arab nation and the citizens of the occupied territory to unite and not to differ or submit to the imperialist and Zionist conspiracies aimed at harming their unity, which is the true and sure guarantee for the achievement of the national historical rights of the Palestinian people to their homeland and to self-determination.

The National Assembly statement stressed that the Arab masses, who believe in the justice of their cause, are commanded to reject all methods of surrender and the imposition of a fait accompli as desired by Zionism and imperialism. It is also demanded that they foil the Zionist plan and effect the required change in the deteriorating Arab situation, the bad fruit of which is represented by this conference.

Palestinians Urged To Oppose Madrid Conference

JN3010102791 Baghdad Voice of Palestine Radio Network in Arabic 1600 GMT 29 Oct 91

[Unattributed talk]

[Text] The hour of collapse is approaching and the moment of downfall will take place when the Arabs shake hands with Shamir, whose history is stained with Palestinian and Arab blood. It is a moment of sorrow and anger; a moment of treason and relinquishment. The blood shed by Shamir, over more than 40 years of our long conflict with Zionism, is our blood, the blood of our fathers and sons, the blood of our youths, our men, our mothers, and our children. It is a trust placed in the hands of our generation. We will neither relinquish this trust nor abandon retaliation for this blood from the criminals, terrorists, traitors, and agents. Nobody, whoever he may be, has the right to sell or ignore this blood.

As we stand up against the godfathers, champions, and zealots of the settlement, we urge our people's sons in the occupied homeland and elsewhere in the diaspora to turn the time of the conference's opening into an hour of vehement popular wrath, in which the land will be scorched under the Zionist invaders' feet. Let the world hear that the people of Palestine will not relinquish their land and will never give up their national historical rights over Palestine. Gather all your anger, stones, and slingshots. Let Palestine, all of Palestine, turn into a volcano erupting in the face of those who are preparing to sign the deal selling our homeland, history, and heritage. Nobody, regardless of his capacity, nationality, or position and the strength of his protector, has the right to cede Palestine. Nobody has the right to forgive the Zionists or begin a new chapter with them at the expense of our blood, the suffering of our people, and sanctity of our land.

Palestine has been an Arab territory since the dawn of history and will remain Arab forever. We shall protect it with our blood and souls and defend it with guns, stones, slingshots, axes, burning tires, and knives. As they are approaching the fifth year of their blessed intifadah, our people in the occupied homeland know how to announce the failure of the Madrid conference, and know what this conference means and what its results and decisions will be. These results will first and foremost be against Palestine, against the Arabs, against the logic of history, and against the heritage of our forefathers. They are results which our people will reject the moment they are announced.

'Armed Skirmishes' in Al-Sulaymaniyah Quelled

JN3010122491 Baghdad INA in Arabic 1120 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Text] Baghdad, 30 Oct (INA)—A spokesman for the Culture and Information Ministry today disclosed details of the provocative acts and crimes committed by irresponsible elements in al-Sulaymaniyah, Kifri, and Klar on 7 and 8 October.

In a statement to INA, the spokesman said: We announced on 9 October that the armed skirmishes that had taken place were caused by irresponsible elements in al-Sulaymaniyah, Kifri, and Klar and that the situation had been brought under control thanks to the high degree of coordination between Defense Minister Staff Lieutenant General Husayn Kamil Hasan and Mas'ud Barzani, head of the Kurdistan Front.

The spokesman added: At the time, we did not want to disclose details of these provocations and crimes of the irresponsible elements out of our eagerness to contain them and maintain the course of dialogue with the Kurdistan Front parties, and out of our sense of responsibility toward our Kurdish people and our national unity, that is being threatened by foreign and colonialist covetousness. The fact that more than three weeks have passed, however, since these crimes were committed without conducting an interrogation of the perpetrators or putting them on trial, as Mr. Jalal Talabani promised Western media, prompts us now to disclose details of these criminal acts so that the sons of our Iraqi people, Arabs and Kurds, can take note of the obstructions and provocations that some are using to hinder an agreement with the Kurdish Front parties.

The spokesman went on say that on 7 October, a criminal clique in al-Sulaymaniyah held 60 officers and soldiers in the city prisoners. After having tied their hands, they shot them in front of foreign reporters whom they allowed to enter al-Sulaymaniyah through Iran.

On the same day, the same criminal clique killed 17 officers and other soldiers at the outskirts of al-Sulaymaniyah city after detaining them without any previous notice.

On the next day, 8 October, they killed another group of officers and soldiers whom they detained in the District of Darbandikhan in al-Sulaymaniyah Governorate. They also savagely mutilated their bodies.

The spokesman said that showing leniency toward those traitorous criminals does not reflect the good faith of the party to which they belong. Rather, it signifies connivance so as to sabotage the course of the dialogue.

Memo to UN Protests U.S. Aircraft 'Violations'

JN3010194491 Baghdad Republic of Iraq Radio Network in Arabic 1900 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Text] U.S. aircraft have continued their violations of Iraqi airspace for surveillance and provocation purposes.

In a memorandum to UN Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar, Iraq's permanent envoy to the United Nations said that yesterday, U.S. aircraft carried out 22 sorties made up of 11 two-plane formations at speeds of 600-900 km per hours and at altitudes of 4-6 km.

The memorandum explains that the hostile U.S. aircraft mainly flew over Zakho, al-'Amadiyah, Irbil, Mosul, Dahuk, and Tall 'Afar. It also says that on the same days, a two-plane U.S. formation crossed latitude 36, 45 km northwest of Karkuk at 800 km per hour and an altitude of 4 km.

Bush Claim of Sympathy for Arab Children Scorned

JN3110092991 Baghdad INA in Arabic 0800 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Text] Baghdad, 31 Oct (INA)—AL-QADISIYAH has scoffed at U.S. President George Bush's pretense that he feels sad for the children of the Middle East.

In an article headlined "The Grief of the Butcher," the paper says: In a clownish performance having exposed objectives and intentions, the U.S. President pretended in his speech at the settlement conference that he is grieving for the children of the Middle East, who, as he claimed, only have expressions of fear on their faces

The paper wonders who planted the obsession of fear in these children, who is the wicked butcher who daily kills the children of Iraq by way of the unjust blockade against the Iraqi people? Who sent his planes to terrify the children of Mosul at the same time the Madrid settlement conference was getting under way?

Concluding, the paper says: What a miserable time it is when a butcher is portrayed as merciful and compassionate.

Return of POW's Released by Iran Reported

JN3010084691 Baghdad INA in Arabic 0743 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Text] Baghdad, 30 Oct (INA)—Some 100 Iraqi prisoners arrived in the country via al-Mundhiriyah after they were released by Iranian authorities last Friday [25 October].

'Abd-al-Wahhab al-Hiti, head of the Iraqi delegation which took part in the Islamic conference for the support of the Palestinian cause held in Tehran between 19 and 22 October, told AL-THAWRAH today that the release of those prisoners came after bilateral meetings between the Iraqi delegation and Mehdi Karrubi, speaker of the Iranian Islamic Majles.

'Abd-al-Wahhab al-Hiti added that the Iraqi delegation discussed with the Iranian delegation means of bolstering bilateral relations and stressed the need for continued meetings and exchanges of official delegations to resolve all the issues between Iraq and Iran, particularly the Iraqi POW's. The Iraqi delegation, he added, also asked Mehdi Karrubi to secure the release of some Iraqi prisoners as a gesture of good faith. Indeed, we were informed that the Iranian authorities agreed to release 100 Iraqi prisoners, who arrived last Friday.

The Iranian Islamic Majles has also been invited to visit Iraq so as to resume dialogue and discussions on means of promoting bilateral ties.

Saddam Addresses Army Officers at Ceremony

JN2910145291 Baghdad INA in Arabic 1216 GMT 29 Oct 91

[Text] Baghdad, 29 Oct (INA)—His Excellency President Saddam Husayn has said that had submission been the duty of the person who is more capable from the technical point of view, all cherished values would have vanished from the face of the earth, and all human values would have been crushed.

His excellency the president added: On a daily basis, the enemies pass resolutions against the Iraqi people, thinking, may they be accursed, that the Iraqi people will kneel. The Iraqi people have learned to kneel only before the one Almighty God.

Talking about enemies and agents, his excellency went on to say: If they deluded themselves into believing that Saddam Husayn would address minor issues, he, by God, will not do so even if they were to turn into monkeys.

This came when his excellency decorated a number of commanding officers with the Mother of Battles badges of honor and medals of courage for their immensely heroic role in resisting the aggression and tearing apart the chapter of treachery and treason.

At the honoring ceremony, His Excellency President Saddam Husayn said: He who is seeking an additional loaf of bread must tighten his belt, he who is seeking further dignity must further tighten his belt, and he who is looking for an open and unhindered future must work to vindicate principles and values. First and foremost, all must rely on God. Then, the joy will be great—it is going to be a joy coupled with honor, and faith in the present and the future.

The president added: Each and every patriotic and honorable Iraqi is a hero in the Mother of Battles, regardless of whether he was honored or not, of whether he bore arms or not. The patriotic and honorable Iraqi individual is a hero because of his constant adherence to his nationalistic views, to his values, and to his criteria, and for his faith in the nation.

Concluding his speech, his excellency addressed the officers of our valiant Armed Forces and all Iraqis saying: You are the champions of truth in the face of injustice; and this is a great honor. The honoring ceremony was attended by Staff General 'Izzat Ibrahim, vice chairman of the Revolution Command Council and deputy commander in chief of the Armed Forces; Hatim Hamdan al-'Izzawi, chief of the Presidential Office; Staff Lieutenant General Husayn Kamil Hasan, minister of defense; and Staff Lieutenant General Iyad Futayyih al-Rawi, army chief of staff. Following is the text of the speech:

Detailed talk about our strength and that of the enemy should not be subject to the usual comparisons. If we assess our strength in terms of capability, it will be more comprehensive than if we assess this strength from the technical side.

Our strength in terms of capability means that we are right, and our strength in terms of capability lies in our faith.

Regarding the enemy, his strength lies only in his technical ability. We would do the greatest injustice to our brave armed forces if we conducted the usual comparison between our strength and the enemy's technical strength. If we conduct such a comparison, we will not reach the correct results, because of the enemy's technical superiority over our forces.

Here, the usual question and our usual answer are raised before us. The question is: If the enemy's superiority over you is at a level that you were aware of before and during the battle, why did you not heed the enemy, or respond to their demands?

The answer, although usual as we have said, is new in that we did not discover it for the first time. It is very old, and our prediction of it is the first relationship between human beings on the face of earth.

The answer is the first example of the divine will when God Almighty assigned the first prophet on the face of the earth to convey His message, which was conveyed through Gabriel, to the believers.

Had submission to the technically stronger been a duty, all cherished values would have vanished from the face of the earth, all humane values would have been crushed, and those who believe in God and his capability would not have existed.

When Staff Brigadier General Ahmad 'Abdallah talks about the enemy, it is natural for him to refer to the enemy's technical superiority. How do the men feel now? When I talk about men, I mean all Iraqis.

In order that the Iraqi women do not to get angry, they would have no importance if they had no good men. Moreover, when we do not have good, glorious women, we do not have higher values. For this reason, I mean all the Iraqis when I say men.

If the excellent men that we have spoken about become scarce at a certain moment in time, this will not shake the values and great beliefs. What is important is the quality of men, not the quantity. In a situation similar to what we have spoken about, and at a difficult stage, nations, races, peoples, and masses could experience, the most important thing is being right. God is justice.

Justice is God's preeminent attribute. The loftiest attributes are His, and God is never surpassed in any respect.

For all the insignificance of man compared with the master of heaven and earth; for all the insignificance of the ordinary human being compared with the attributes setting messengers and prophets apart; and for the all the insignificance of the attributes of ordinary human beings relevant to the attributes of the companions of the Prophet and to those whom we look up to as paradigms throughout our honorable history, we are trying to take some of their attributes in order to approximate the bright models of the faithful companions of the Prophet.

These are the kinds of people that set standards. Let us suppose that some people wavered for half a minute. This is not the kind of people we should emulate.

So, who are the ideal human beings? They are the people who stay the course—those who aspire to the loftiest attributes. In this regard, the highest degree of democracy is building on the foundations of a minority without whose attributes society would unravel.

Thus the attributes of this minority which aspires to idealism will become the creed of the majority. Let us assume we asked ourselves, or, that we were asked about the direction in which humanity and those who pursue loftier human postures are heading. Let's ask if there is anything human in 33 nations committing aggression against Iraq, not to mention the support they received in the economic, psychological, and intelligence terms. Let's ask whether humanity lies on the side of the 18 million striving Iraqis, including those who strayed for a brief period, since there is a difference between those who deviate temporarily and those who knowingly and deliberately veer off the right course.

In answering this question, I unhesitatingly say that humanity lies with the 18 million Iraqis, and that true humanity lies with these 18 million Iraqis and not with the 33 nations.

In order for us to safeguard our correct evaluation of human character and in order for us to safeguard our faith in humanity, let us try the description from another angle. The answer to this question lies not so much in who represents these nations in the highest echelons of power and those who were responsible for that evil, vicious decison to commit aggression as in the humanity of the people of these nations.

At this point, the other side would argue that the peoples of those states vest their wills in their representatives, and that most of them have obtained the approval of their parliaments. Our decisive and fundamental answer to them is: Had your people—the people of those 33 states, including the American people—been provided with facts as they are without falsification, the foremost falsifier being the President of the United States, and all the big and small presidents and kings who took part in this odious crime against the Iraqi people, those people would not have allowed such resolutions to be adopted against the Iraqi people.

I am certain that they will be ashamed of themselves with every passing week or month [words indistinct] will remain [words indistinct] for thousands of years to come because of their aggression against Iraq.

The generations that follow those evil ones will continue to feel shame whenever they read about the aggressive campaign against the Iraqi people, and whenever new information and facts about this campaign are revealed, especially facts and information that have been withheld from people at the present time; however, the future will certainly reveal these facts.

I say the generations will be ashamed of this disgraceful operation and will curse the evil [word indistinct] in their graves. Some short-sighted people and those looking for an easy living argue that "had you yielded to their will, we would now be leading a comfortable and easy life."

Have you not heard this argument?

If, here is hypothetical, because we would have never done that, because such a thing is absolutely rejected and unthinkable; I say let us suppose that such a thing took place just for the sake of argument. Had that happened, do you know who our enemies would have been? Our enemies would have been the honorable nationalists who uphold higher values.

Even if those enemies were fewer, they were right. They would have been against us, and would have told us: You, who said so and so, have yielded. You have yielded after raising slogans for the sake of which we have struggled, and under the banner of which we have fought. They would add: This is shameful. Oh disgrace! Thus, we are not on your side.

Had we done so, our enemies now would have been the honorable nationalists; however, with our enemies being the dirty traitors, or those who drop from the ranks of the Arab nation whenever they find it easy to commit a crime, this would be a great honor. It is a great honor that our enemies are dropouts from the ranks of humanity, dropouts led by the U.S. President. This is a great honor. It is not a transient or a personal honor, because we already got this honor from 1959 when we were young. What I mean is the honor of the nation, the people, history, and supreme values which will constitute the basis for generations after us and for thousands of years to come.

Yes, these generations will pursue the higher values of the Mother of Battles. The entire nation will rise with stronger resolve and will adhere to the higher values proceeding from the example set in the Mother of Battles.

Thus, the Iraqi harvest will not be simply something to eat. Their harvest will be their winning during the present in terms of an improved livelihood, God willing, in addition to a great status in history and the future, indefinitely.

In one of the battles in early Islamic days, the commander was Muhammad, the messenger of God, may God's peace and blessings be upon him. After he reminded his Muslim companions of the values of faith, dates were distributed to the fighters as food rations. One of his companions said: If there is nothing between me and the paradise you are talking about but throwing away these dates, then I do not need them. Then, he threw them away, unsheathed his sword, and went to fight and suffer martyrdom.

We want paradise. The path to paradise starts here and extends until doomsday. In other words, we want the values of those who believe in paradise to be manifested here in this world. We also want paradise in the hereafter. He who has no higher values should not expect to go to paradise. He who looks for trivialities, his resolve declines when he sees the livelihood becoming tighter and not easy as he wishes, and does not seek higher values instead, such a person cannot have paradise as his final abode.

Yes, paradise is not in our hand to give to whoever we want. We have not [words indistinct] its keys. Praise be to God, the keys are in the hand of the Lord of heaven and earth; however, it is like that.

I do not want to attempt religious interpretations. But I [words indistinct] based on my own conviction. I believe that hell and heaven start in this world. Life in this world is short. Life, be it short or long, is destined to end as God has written for everyone. The hereafter is lasting. It is more important.

The true criterion of heaven and hell is in the hereafter, and it all depends on how one fares in this world. Those who steer off the right course in this world will go straight to hell, and I don't think we can argue about that. Those who stray off the right course in this world will find the gates of hell open before them.

Our values are such that an Italian poet the other day composed and published a poem lauding you. You have not seen him nor he you. You do not know him nor does he know you. But over in Italy he wrote a poem saying that when all the world said yes to the tyrant, Iraq said no.

So, where does humanity lie? It lies in this Italian and not in a bad Arab ruler who would like nothing better than for you to say yes to injustice. Such an accursed Arab ruler would say yes to injustice so that he should be in harmony with his inner weakness, since he has, throughout, been used to saying yes to those who have control over him. Indeed, it was because he said yes to them when he was young, against the will of his own people, that he became head of state.

This type of failure would like for you to fall in the darkest well to make up for their inferiority. What are we to say to them? We say to them: What can we do more than we have done? We have unavailingly attempted to reform you, failures. We sought to guide you to the right road so that we might rid you of your feelings of inferiority. We have attempted to embellish your images. We then made you walk ahead of the representatives of Iraq. We have approached you gingerly, but you did not seem to like the path of strength, honesty, and solidarity, and chose instead the road of treason, treachery, and baseness. And yet, I say that what God wants is the best thing. He addressed Himself to His dear prophet saying: It is true thou wilt not be able to guide everyone who thou lovest; but God guides those whom he will. [Koranic verse]

Whatever God wants is necessarily good. Therefore, it will not do to say had we done this or that, the consequences would have been better, since what happened was willed by God.

Once more, I ask: Where is humanity? It lies in a lady from the USSR urging her children to show solidarity with Iraq.

Humanity lies in an Italian parliamentary group rejecting injustice and 10 Americans rejecting the injustice of their Zionist-controlled president.

So, this is the bridge of humanity upon which all nations on earth meet to uphold the humanitarian values of justice and equality, the way God Almighty wants all mankind to.

Also, mark how God has exposed them! Had they lifted the blockade on Iraq immediately after the fighting ended, the Iraqi people, and humanity at large, would have probably missed many facts, and they [Iraq's opponents] would have given their words some form of credibility. They could have said: Do you see. We do not entertain any ambitions in Iraq or the nation. Immediately after the withdrawal of the Iraqi Army, under the pressure of fighting, we lifted the blockade on the Iraqi people and returned things to their previous course as if nothing had happened.

You see how their daily actions, however, confirm the sound analysis given by the Iraqi leadership to the Iraqi people, when it told them that the battle did not start in August 1990, or for the reasons announced by the aggressors; the battle began a long time ago and the reason was the birth of an individual rejected by them.

They do not want to see any new faithful individual in any corner of the nation, especially an individual who can be an example, guide his nation and make it commit itself to its rights and defend these rights.

They did not wage war against factories or the economy or oil. Their objective was not to prevent us from selling our oil to them or to others; they targeted the new individual.

They did not target your combat capability, even in its comprehensive, not only technical, sense. Their objective was to destroy the human quality you have created. Imagine that three U.S. armored divisions could not confront one Iraqi armored division. Why? Technically speaking, they do have a tank that matches the TS72. Why then does a U.S. tank not confront an Iraqi tank? Because, on the one hand, we have an Iraqi individual who believes in what he is doing, while on the other we have an aggressive invader who came from outside to invade us at the orders of his rulers under the pretext of restoring Kuwait. The evidence of what I am saying is that they are daily issuing resolutions at the Security Council. America is holding the whip to flog the backs of ill-starred nations.

America is striking at necks with heads bowed down. They are like al-hiran, a name used for the baby camels before they are weaned. Every day they issue a resolution against the Iraqi people, thinking, curse them, that the Iraqi people will kneel before them.

The people of Iraq have never learned to kneel, except before Almighty God. We open our ears to everything, the good and the bad. A few days ago, one of the accursed people who earn their living from ill-gotten money, spread a rumor that bread and other foodstuffs would only reach the Iraqi people for a few more days. He meant that the little which is now coming into Iraq will no longer be available. When they were asked why, one of them answered: Of course because Saddam Husayn made strong remarks on television last night, they would punish us for this.

I tell this person, and the 10 or 20 persons like him; I tell the 5,000 who fit this description, who want a morsel even if it is dipped in the blood of their people—and even though it might block the people's future—I tell all of these people that they are harboring an illusion if they think that Saddam Husayn talks about trivial matters. Saddam Husayn will not talk about trivial matters, even if they are all transformed into monkeys.

We tell the shortsighted this time, not the malicious ones, that in this age, he who talks with humility will be trampled under foot. If they think that humility and addressing Bush as "Mr. President" might lead America to have sympathy toward some traders, I tell them that this is useless talk, devoid of dignity.

I am certain that the majority of these people are patriotic and noble. What I was referring to is the element that built for their hopes and future a bridge that extends outside the interests of their nation and people.

This is what Bush wishes. He wants to see people wringing their hands in front of him and calling him Mr. President, so that their tongues and heads can be trampled underfoot. They do not know humanity. They do not know the value of words. They do not read or hear good speech. In other words, they will not be affected from the human point of view. Had they been amenable to human values, they would have been influenced by daily reports from newspapers and humanitarian organizations, who have visited Iraq, concerning children and the elderly who are dying because of lack of medicine.

The nation is the source of humanism. The branches of humanism extend outside the nation. I do not say this out of prejudice, rather I am relying on what God the Almighty said. Those who believe in one God must believe that the source of humanism is the nation. When the nation becomes emancipated in order to reach its humanism in its faithful, comprehensive meaning, it will be able to lead humanity to the furthest point possible and at a higher level.

When the nation exceeds the limits of its legitimate leading role, then humanism becomes weak, not only within the nation itself, but also in the entire world.

Bush has no sense of humanism. Therefore, one must not be deluded that sweet talk could make the snake leave its den. This spotted snake was made by Zionism which made it president and gave it duties. Many leaders in the West are made by Zionism. So, he who looks for an extra loaf should tighten an extra belt, and he who looks for extra dignity should tighten an extra belt. He who looks for an open future, free of restrictions, should triumph for principles and values, and rely, first and foremost, on God. Only then, will relaxation be great. It is a relaxation that is coupled with honor and faith, at present and in the future.

Every time the enemies of Iraq see the people of Iraq united, capable, strong, and in a better shape, as they should be, then they deal with the situation as it is. Only then will their annoyance and injustice against the Iraqi people stop. Therefore, the weak ones should reconsider their positions as soon as possible to give a signal to the defeated ones outside Iraq that they have no future. The future will only come by dealing with the people of Iraq as they are, and by respecting their will and free choice.

Honoring people takes place in accordance with their stands. Every honest, patriotic Iraqi is a hero in the Mother of Battles, whether he was honored or not, and whether he carried arms or not. He is a hero because his national values and standards and his faith in his nation remained intact. He is a unique hero. If we ask: Who represents the nation? The answer would be every citizen in the Arab countries represents the nation in light of the standards we spoke about. He is the one who has faith in the nation and rejects injustice and slavery, who refuses to be enslaved by people or to enslave other people, who truly believes that the Arabs are one nation, he believes that the nation's wealth must come in the service of this nation, and he who transforms his faith in God into sacrifice and action.

I say that such a man, wherever he may be, inside or outside the government, a shepherd or a philosopher, a university teacher or a mother, represents the nation.

You are the true leaders in the face of injustice. This is a great honor. May God bless you. Congratulations to you on this honor. Congratulations to your families, to every Iraqi who adopted a sound position, to your people who want you to score unprecedented positions. This is because what you have confronted and continue to confront, and what you have endured and are enduring, is something that is not written except by the will of almighty God. Congratulations to your mothers, to your cities, villages, and tribes. Congratulations to your Ba'th Party, whether or not you are affiliated with the party.

Saddam Inaugurates Baghdad Bridge, Hails Workers

JN3010184491 Baghdad INA in Arabic 1735 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Excerpts] Baghdad, 30 Oct (INA)—President Saddam Husayn today inaugurated the al-Jumhuriyah bridge, walking from the al-Rasafah side to al-Karkh. The bridge was reconstructed after it was destroyed by the American aggressors, their Atlantic and Zionist allies, and their Arab slaves as part of a plan to destroy the infrastructure built by the proud Iraqis. [passage omitted]

President Saddam Husayn spoke to the engineers, the technicians, the workers, and the Iraqi citizens who gathered around him. He congratulated his people on the construction revolution they are effectively carrying out. This revolution constitutes an eloquent reply to the aggressors and their agents, asserts Iraq's steadfastness in the face of the economic blockade, and projects the final page of Iraq's victory in the Mother of Battles.

The workers expressed their joy over what their minds and hands have achieved, stressing their absolute love for and loyalty to President Saddam Husayn, builder of Iraq's glory, protector of its land, and bearer of its banner on the path of freedom and progress.

Talabani—Stalemate Means 'No War, No Peace'

PM3110114191 London AL-HAYAH in Arabic 29 Oct 91 p 5

[Report on interview with Jalal Talabani, leader of the Patriotic Union of Kurdistan, by Kamran Qurrah Daghi in London; date not given]

[Excerpts] Jalal Talabani, leader of the Patriotic Union of Kurdistan, has revealed that he signed a bilateral agreement with Mas'ud Barzani, leader of the Democratic Party of Kurdistan and joint leader with him of the Iraqi Kurdistan Front, on the Kurdish demands of Baghdad. There is also an agreement between the two parties which stipulates their staying together "in war and peace." He said that Barzani emphasized to him his adherence to the outcome of that meeting.

In an interview with AL-HAYAH he said that signing the present autonomy plan proposed by Baghdad would mean "the end of the Kurdish movement and world sympathy for the Kurds." He said that the U.S. Administration officially promised the Front's delegation which visited Washington recently to protect the Kurds and deter Iraq if it started a war against them. He added that it is not true that Washington favors the replacement of one dictatorship with another. In fact it wants "democratic, parliamentary, pluralist rule" in Iraq.

He called for a referendum of the Kurdish people on the draft agreements (the four papers), which he said have, regrettably, not been published until now "because of lack of a consensus" on the matter in the Kurdistan Front. He did say, however, that they would be published on the eve of the expected referendum. And he saw Baghdad agreeing "to only 15 percent" of the Kurdish side's demands.

On the tour by the Front delegation led by him to Turkey, the United States, and West Europe, Talabani said that it had made "an important political gain." He said that this is the first time the U.S. Administration has established official relations with the Kurds.

And he believes that the alternative to a failure to reach agreement with Baghdad will not be war, but rather "a state of no war, no peace," which could last for a long time. And he believes that the Kurdish movement should play a bigger role within the framework of the Iraqi opposition, which he invited to hold a conference in the "liberated" areas of Iraqi Kurdistan.

Asked about the truth about the disagreements between him and Barzani over the position toward Baghdad and agreement with it, Talabani said that the Front's parties rely on different ideological positions, "so that ideological, political, and social disagreements are to be expected." And interpretations are a natural thing, especially when it comes to important, serious, and complicated issues like the position toward the Iraqi Government and agreement with it. However, he said that the disagreement "is not over the basic principles and demands (....) as there is an agreement—signed by Brother Mas'ud, myself, and six other officials representing the six other parties participating in the Kurdistan Front—on the minimum Kurdish demands with regard to autonomy. In addition, there is another agreement signed between me and Brother Mas'ud Barzani. [passage omitted]

Talabani said that it "would be unrealistic" for the U.S. forces to "intervene in every minor clash that occurs between us and the Iraqi forces." But they will intervene if the Iraqi Government organizes a large-scale campaign against the Kurds. [passage omitted]

Talabani believes that war is not the alternative to agreement with Baghdad. "And we believe that the state of no war, no peace is a thousand times better than war. And that state must continue, because the international situation dictates it. Resolution 688, which is backed by the coalition forces, requires the stabilization of security and peace in northern and southern Iraq. Thus it is not in our interests to deviate from the international decision and turn the world against us. Failure to sign the agreement with Baghdad does not mean a return to war. And the Kurdish region in Iraq has witnessed periods of no war, no peace in the past. The most recent was in 1983, when we entered negotiations with Baghdad and a truce continued until 1985. And I do not believe that there is anything to prevent the present truce continuing for another two years or more."

Asked about relations with the other Iraqi opposition parties, Talabani said that it is wrong to accuse the Kurds of diverging from them, since "we are agreed with them on the need to end dictatorship. As for the means of toppling it, they differ according to interpretations. And we have not stopped anyone from pursuing a line which they deem suitable for destroying the dictatorship. But if some of the brothers want to make the Kurdish revolution their passage to the achievement of that aim, then they must first agree with the Kurdish movement and provide for it the necessary elements for joint action for the sake of victory in that serious task. And in such a case an understanding must be reached with the Kurdish leadership on the future of Iraq." [passage omitted]

Talabani Protests Turkish Raids Over Kurdistan

NC2910203491 (Clandestine) Voice of the People of Kurdistan in Arabic 1700 GMT 29 Oct 91

[Text] On his way back to the homeland, brother Jalal Talabani, secretary general of the Patriotic Union of Kurdistan [PUK], stopped in Turkey for talks with Turkish and foreign officials.

He protested Turkish air attacks on defenseless civilians in Iraqi Kurdistan, explaining that such irresponsible acts would surely besmirch Turkey's reputation, and good relations between the Kurdish and Turkish people, whose enemies would try to exploit the issue.

Talabani made his protest, calling for a complete halt to attacks, at a meeting with Suleyman Demirel, incoming prime minister and leader of the True Path Party.

He also denounced the attacks in a telephone conversation with Turgut Ozal, and to the Turkish Foreign Ministry. Talabani's intensity persuaded Turkey to send a special commission to Iraqi Kurdistan tomorrow 30 October to assess the damage to villages, and pay compensation.

Yesterday Talabani met with the French ambassador in Ankara, and today with the ambassadors of Japan, the United States, the United Kingdom, Germany, and Canada, discussing with them:

1. Current events in Kurdistan and Iraq.

2. The need to implement UN Security Council Resolution 688 and form a special committee to oversee its implementation.

3. The need to extend urgent humanitarian aid to the Kurdish refugees as winter approaches and food costs more.

Saddam Waging 'Economic War' on Kurdish Refugees

NC3110143991 (Clandestine) Voice of Iraqi People in Arabic 1300 GMT 31 Oct 91 (tentative)

[Text] The leader of the Patriotic Union of Kurdistan, Jalal Talabani, (?has stated) that the defeated regime withdrew government forces and services from the north two days ago, and described the move as an economic war against refugees.

During a news conference in Ankara, he added that the regime is planning to withdraw civil services from the area, constituting a declaration of economic war against the Kurdish people, particularly as winter approaches. He said it means that tens of thousands of people will be deprived of their salaries, and that the defeated tyrant will cut off supplies of petroleum, gas, and foodstuffs distributed by ration cards in the area, currently inhabited by 3 million people.

He added that northern Iraq will not get electric power supplies unless the Kurds succeed in operating the turbine-powered generators at the Dukan dam, an area controlled by Kurdish gunmen.

Talabani announced that he had urged Turkish separatist Kurds not to launch attacks against Turkey from northern Iraq. He was concerned about Turkish cross-border attacks on northern Iraq while pursuing Kurdish Workers Party gunmen stationed there.

Talabani met with [words indistinct], nominated two days ago for the Turkish prime minister's post, and told him he fully supports Turkey's sovereignty and territorial integrity.

Talabani, Barzani Sign Bilateral Accord

NC2910171291 (Clandestine) Voice of Iraqi People in Arabic 1300 GMT 29 Oct 91

[Text] Jalal Talabani, leader of the Patriotic Union of Kurdistan [PUK], has said that he signed a bilateral accord on Kurdish demands with leader of [words indistinct] of Kurdistan.

Talabani told AL-HAYAH today that Barzani said he was committed to the accord, which stipulates minimum Kurdish demands on autonomy. Talabani did not say what these are but said that the tyrant agreed only five [word indistinct].

Talabani (?admitted) that the two sides have not finally agreed certain points that are still being negotiated, but noted that the Kurdish groups are determined to win all their demands: Otherwise, he said, these negotiations will end in a fiasco.

Barzani Opposes 'Arabization' Policy, Urges Peace

JN3010083291 (Clandestine) Voice of Iraqi Kurdistan in Arabic 1645 GMT 29 Oct 91

[Text] Respected listeners, a short while ago, you heard Struggler Comrade Mas'ud Barzani's important speech to the masses of (Basilia) and the Sumayl plane during his visit there on 24 October.

In his historic speech, Barzani said: Oh masses of (Basilia) and the Sumayl plain, I congratulate you on your return to the land of your fathers and forefathers.

Alluding to the error and futility of the Arabization policy, which had been implemented against the will of the people of this region, as well as in other regions of Kurdistan, Barzani said: We are not racists, but what happened in this regard was unjust and unfair. Otherwise, we are prepared to share our homes with our Arab bothers if they need it one day and whenever the need arises. If they try to Arabize Kurdistan by force, we will defend our land by all means.

Struggler Mas'ud Barzani added: The freedom and gains you are enjoying today are the fruits of our martyrs' blood and the heroism of the Kurdistan peshmergas.

Struggler Barzani then explained the issue of the negotiations [with the Iraqi Government] and affirmed that we are not for war but for the peace option, with the aim of solving our legitimate problems.

Al-Zubaydi Chairs Meeting on Local Market Situation

JN3010185491 Baghdad Republic of Iraq Radio Network in Arabic 1700 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Excerpts] Prime Minister Muhammad Hamzah al-Zubaydi chaired a meeting today to discuss the local market situation and the free movement of commodities and goods. [passage omitted]

During the meeting, they also reviewed the best ways to secure the flow of commodities and goods into the local market, to provide them at appropriate prices, and to overcome obstacles blocking the easy flow of these commodities. Hamid Salih al-Rawi, head of the Council of Minister's secretariat, attended the meeting.

Left, Right React to Shamir's Madrid Speech

'General Satisfaction' Seen

TA3110164891 Tel Aviv IDF Radio in Hebrew 1600 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Report by party affairs correspondent Yaron Deqel]

[Excerpts] Prime Minister Shamir seems today to have managed to please both Moledet and Peace Now, which is the clearest sign of the general satisfaction of Israeli politicians of both camps following Shamir's address in Madrid. Not everyone is pleased, of course, but the prime minister is winning positive responses.

Let us start with the left-wing: Hayim Oron of MAPAM [United Workers Party] said that the prime minister is advancing correctly and that MAPAM will back him. Shulamit Aloni of the CRM [Citizens Rights Movement], on the other hand, said that there was nothing new in Shamir's speech. [passage omitted covered in referent item]

Summing up the left-wing positions is Yosi Sarid of CRM, who said: This is a speech that we can be content with, but it leaves an aftertaste of disappointment. Shamir did not drop a handkerchief for the other side to pick up. It was a reasonable speech with no initiative, Sarid said.

The Labor Party can also live with the speech. Yitzhaq Rabin said: The speech contained points of consensus, but we have to look ahead, in the direction of territorial compromise as well. Knesset Member [MK] Binyamin Ben-Eli'ezer said that it was a good and thorough speech.

In general, the right-wing is satisfied, though some—MK Ge'ula Kohen for one—are not. Moledet Minister Rehav'am Ze'evi said that as long as Shamir does not mention giving up territories or Palestinian autonomy, Moledet will support him. [passage omitted covered in referent item]

Tehiya Minister Yuval Ne'eman found four positive points in Shamir's speech, among them the fact that Eretz Yisra'el, not just the State of Israel, was mentioned and the opposition to discussing territorial issues. Tehiya, however, no longer speaks with a single voice. Ge'ula Kohen says just the opposite: It was a grave and disappointing speech, which contained a willingness to discuss territory.

To sum up, the right in general is supportive of the prime minister. Yitzhaq Shamir will return to a 61-MK coalition and will not need, at least at the current stage, the safety nets offered by the left-wing parties. The possible political crisis has been postponed, at least for now.

Peace Now, Settlers, Tehiya Comment

TA3110125691 Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in Hebrew 1200 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Excerpts] Minister Roni Milo says that the prime minister's Madrid speech has served the State of Israel's cause in the best possible way. The speech tipped the scales in our favor, emphasizing that we are a small country facing a big Arab world and that any controversy over territories is therefore beside the point. [passage omitted]

The Peace Now movement says that the prime minister has made an important speech which left all the doors open. Peace Now hopes that the speech heralds a chance to see changed positions and that the Shamir we will find in future negotiations will not be the same Shamir we know.

The Council of Jewish Settlements in Judaea, Samaria, and Gaza says that the prime minister's address was a small ray of light in the darkness of the Madrid conference. It congratulates the prime minister for the principles he has proffered and expresses the hope that he will back up his remarks by continuing the construction drive throughout Eretz Yisra'el.

Tehiya Knesset Member Elyaqim Ha'etzni has sent the prime minister a telegram saying the following: Congratulations for the wonderful speech, which has enhanced Israel's status and voiced our truth—and only the truth—in a loud and clear voice.

Ze'evi on Shamir Speech, Madrid Conference

TA3110202391 Jerusalem Israel Television Network in Hebrew 1840 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Studio interview with Minister Without Portfolio Rehav'am Ze'evi, Moledet's leader, by Yoram Ronen—live]

[Excerpts] [Ronen] Knesset Member Elyaqim Ha'etzni of Tehiya, who is known for his opposition to the peace conference, congratulated the prime minister on his speech in Madrid. Minister Ze'evi, do you join in congratulating Shamir?

[Ze'evi] I believe that Shamir's speech was a Zionist, Jewish, and good speech. Still, it lacked a few points that, had I been consulted, I would have added. Mr. Shamir did not mention that it was the Arabs who created the refugee problem. He did not mention that 75 percent of the area slated for the Jewish national home—namely, the portion across the Jordan River—was taken away from us in 1922. He did not mention that the western Eretz Yisra'el is a single geopolitical unit that cannot be divided into separate political entities.

[Ronen] Nevertheless, Minister Ze'evi, you are saying that the speech was good. So, in retrospect, have you changed your mind, and might you now say that it was good for Israel to have participated in the Madrid conference?

[Ze'evi] Mr. Shamir's speech, as good as it was, was only one of many speeches, and part of a horrible steamroller, of a pressure campaign waged in all world media. His speech was a drop in the sea, leaving no trace behind. Now, of all times, after two days of the conference, I know how correct I was in saying we should not go to this conference. I knew it would be a propaganda machine, a huge steamroller, and a horrible trap that would exert psychological pressure on Jews in Israel and throughout the world. This was totally unnecessary.

[Ronen] If we had not participated in the conference, we would have left the arena open for the Arab delegations, would we not?

[Ze'evi] No, my friend. If we had not gone, there would not have been an arena. It takes two to tango; the conference would not have been held without us.

[Ronen] In a ministerial consultation in Jerusalem yesterday, you said that our public relations effort in Madrid is not very good. In fact, you agreed with criticism leveled by Foreign Minister David Levi about our public relations policy there. What is deficient about it?

[Ze'evi] First, I did not say anything about that yesterday. I had strong criticism for the defense establishment regarding the situation on the Lebanese border and in Judaea, Samaria, and Gaza. I cannot elaborate on what I said at the Inner Cabinet, but I did not speak about our public relations. I think Binyamin Netanyahu is doing a great job. I recommended to Shamir that Netanyahu be included in the Israeli delegation, contrary to the foreign minister's wish when it was still he who was supposed to head the delegation. My criticism concerns the concessions that were made about several points, as if they had not been important, such as allowing the PLO, under the Palestinians' cover, to speak for 45 minutes during the conference. [passage omitted]

[Ronen] Minister Ze'evi, in conclusion, the prime minister is speaking about very long negotiations that may feature crises and explosions, difficulties and ups and downs. I believe that you will agree that it will be very difficult to stop the bus that has just left Madrid.

[Ze'evi] I saw many buses with punctured tires, especially in the territories, where nails are planted on the roads. I propose that we do not give up our homeland; that we do not give up the lands of Eretz Yisra'el; that we do not establish a Palestinian autonomy west of the Jordan River, which will be only an advance stage for the foundation of a PLO-Palestinian state next to our home, so that we do not find ourselves in a very miserable opening position in the next war.

[Ronen] Do you believe that the current government can accomplish all you suggest?

[Ze'evi] There are two alternatives to the current government. First, a national unity government; that is, the Alignment and the Likud together again, but this combination lacks unity and is not a national government either. The other alternative, God forbid, is a government led by the Labor Party. The best of the three options then is a Likud-led government, as long as it does not give up Eretz Yisra'el territories, as long as it does not seriously deal with the establishment of autonomy. This is the best option, and as long as this is the case, as long as Shamir does not give up a single dunam of land, he will have my support.

Syrian Delegate 'Scored Points'

TA0111105691 Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in Hebrew 0948 GMT 1 Nov 91

[Telephone interview with Minister Without Portfolio Rehav'am Ze'evi by Me'ir Einstein in Jerusalem and Shalom Qital in Madrid—live]

[Text] [Einstein] Good morning, Minister Ze'evi.

[Ze'evi] Good morning.

[Einstein] What is your comment on what happened in Madrid this morning?

[Ze'evi] I think that the Israeli delegation should have left the conference. We recall that during the Camp David talks, the Egyptian delegation quit over a far minor issue, when Mr. Begin addressed one of the diplomats as: Young man. That offended them. But to call the prime minister a terrorist, to poke fun at his height, and so on—all this is a cause, not a pretext, for leaving the place, never to return until that Syrian representative learns how to talk properly.

[Einstein] Well, that may have been precisely his purpose. We would then be playing into his hands.

[Ze'evi] Excellent! To my mind, and according to what I believe in, this would be wonderful. Then the whole conference will be off. This is preferable to having one big circus to show Israel in a bad light as wrong, unjust, and discriminatory. Even though the prime minister delivered two nice speeches, they became a drop in the ocean compared with the huge wave of Arab speeches of hatred and lies which are being disseminated all over the world media. We let them exploit all the world's largest networks for three days to slander us—the Jewish people, as well as those living in Zion. This does not contribute to our good health or strength. We did not need this farce. If the Syrian delegate did us a service and we had exploited it, we would have been the proverbial righteous man whose work is done by others.

[Einstein] Incidentally, do you think he scored points in the eyes of the world public?

[Ze'evi] I saw that Baker squirmed, but there is no doubt that the Syrian scored points in the Arab world. All the Arab delegates view him as the spearhead, and they align themselves according to the line he advocates. Even the Palestinians, who hesitated earlier about whether or not to flirt with the Syrians, are currently courting the Syrian delegate. The Syrians are calling the shots, and their tone is extremist, nonconciliatory, and will not lead to peace. In general, the Syrians did not come to Madrid to achieve or make peace; they came to retrieve their lost Golan Heights. This is the only thing that interests them, and this is what they are striving for, using all the methods and all the means. Peace will not come out of Madrid, nor will health or honor or a good name for Israel.

When such things are said about the prime minister, what can be simpler than to get up, leave, and tell the world: We will not sit with such a man at a conference that was convened on the basis of peace.

[Qital] Even before today's events in Madrid, the Israeli delegation distinguished between Palestinians, the Jordanians, and the Syrians. Although Haydar 'Abd-al-Shafi's comments were not those of a lover of Zion, the impression nonetheless was that with the exception of the Syrians, it is possible to talk with everyone. Can you not share this distinction?

[Ze'evi] There is a difference between one Arab country and the other, but they can still all be lumped together under one banner: that of wanting to see Israel destroyed and eliminated—each in his own style, with a different volume of calumnies and curses, with a varied level of falsehoods; nonetheless, they are all a chip off the old block. True, there is a difference between the physician from Gaza and the minister from Damascus, but it is a stylistic difference. As for substance, there is no difference. Both want to see us in the sea, and they have said as much all along; both support the Palestinian Covenant, which calls for the complete liberation of Palestine in an armed struggle. So why should we hide behind finer words? Are we not mature enough to realize that this is bait? Can we swallow it because someone spoke in nicer language, wore a tie, or did not wear a keffiyeh? They all hate us; none of them wants us. They all want to retrieve not only the so-called occupied territories; they want Yafo, Haifa, Tiberias, Lod, Ashqelon, and Beersheba, and they have said as much.

[Einstein] Did you hear that in the remarks by Haydar 'Abd-al-Shafi?

[Ze'evi] I heard whomever I managed to hear; I did not listen to all of them religiously or with great patience, but I reached my conclusions from one thing or another. I continue to do my regular work, as I do not think this festival should paralyze us. If I hear one more speech or not makes no difference. We must realize whom we are dealing with. Zionism is a thorn in the Arabs nation's heart. If, God forbid, they get Judaea, Samaria, and Gaza today, they will want Yafo tomorrow, and the next day they will make demands on Beersheba, while we refuse to understand this, even though they say so explicitly. All we need to do is read the Palestinian Covenant, which 'Abd-al-Shafi, being a PLO representative, clutches. The PLO has not amended its Covenant, which it cannot do anyway without a special majority. When they formulated the Covenant, they made sure to word it in a way that will preclude any change. They want the full liberation of Palestine through an armed struggle, including even the place where you sit, in the Jerusalem studio.

[Einstein] Thank you very much, Minister Rehav'am Ze'evi.

Ze'evi on Shamir Rebuttal

TA0111094091 Tel Aviv IDF Radio in Hebrew 0907 GMT 1 Nov 91

[Text] We have reactions to today's rebuttal speeches. Minister Rehav'am Ze'evi says that the prime minister's two good speeches were washed away by the flood of Arab words of hatred and lies disseminated through the world media. This is proof, says Ze'evi, that we were right in saying that we had no business going to Madrid and that we would not find honor, peace, and security there.

The Council of Jewish Settlements in Judaea, Samaria, and Gaza reacted to the prime minister's rebuttal by saying that its members are familiar through living in the area with what Shamir presented. Our correspondent in the territories, Udi Segal, reports that last night the prime minister met with the Council's information delegation in Madrid. A source in the council estimated that that was the reason for Shamir's mention in his address of the massacre in Hebron and the Palestinian reaction to the Scuds.

Weizman, Peres on Golan, Settlement Issues

NC3110204091 Cairo Egyptian Space Channel in Arabic 1900 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Report on telephone interviews with former Israeli Defense Minister Ezer Weizman and Labor Party leader Shim'on Peres by Cairo Egyptian Space Channel correspondent Yahya Ghanim; date and place not given]

[Text] At the start of the interview, Weizman apologized to viewers of Egyptian television for being unable to speak to them in Arabic.

In reply to a question on what he expects from the international peace conference in Madrid, Weizman said that the conference is the first step on a long road that began with the peace treaty with Egypt. He believes all parties need to reach a comprehensive and final peace. He also hopes for the establishment of peaceful relations with Syria.

In reply to a question on whether he would be willing to return the occupied Arab territories to achieve these goals if he were in prime minister Shamir's place, Weizman said that he had said in the past that full peace with Syria cannot be achieved before returning the

Golan to Syrian sovereignty. He said that this is a precondition to the discussion of any good relations with Damascus, adding that what should be applied to the Golan applies to the West Bank and Gaza after resolving the issue of borders with these two areas.

We also had a telephone interview with Shim'on Peres, leader of the opposition Labor Party. In answer to a question on how far he would go for the sake of peace had he been participating in the Madrid conference, he said: I believe that we would have acted to freeze more settlements. He believed this could coincide with an end to the Arab boycott of Israel in accordance with President Husni Mubarak's proposal and a halt to the intifadah.

Peres added that the Labor Party supports the principle of land for peace and that this is the basic difference between him and the Likud.

On Shamir's decision to lead the delegation and the significance of this decision, Peres said: I am happy that Shamir is sitting opposite the Palestinian delegation. This means he is recognizing them.

Asked what he would say to those opposing the peace process, both on the Israeli and the Arab sides, Peres said: I would suggest they ponder the alternative: death, the spread of terror, terrorizing children, and the loss of great opportunities. He added that the alternative is soaked with blood.

Peres went on to say that peace could be the best way for building a new Middle East where Arabs, Muslims, Christians, and Israelis live side by side and where each can preserve his national identity and pray according to his holy book.

Peres—Conference 'Opened Door'

TA3110193091 Tel Aviv IDF Radio in Hebrew 1655 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Telephone interview with Labor Party Chairman Shim'on Peres in Tel Aviv by Rafi Reshef in the Madrid studio—live]

[Excerpt] [Reshef] Shalom, Mr. Peres. Could you please sum up this day for us?

[Peres] Look, I am not expert on speeches and no literary critic. I can refer to the conference. The conference is far from being a mere ceremonial gathering. This is a conference that established facts, some of which are far reaching. The main facts are: It was proven that there is a big world out there that is serious in its determination to solve the Middle East problem, and it is no longer divided on the solution.

Second, a Palestinian delegation has been set up. It is recognized by the whole world and, in fact, by Israel. We all know the extent of its affiliation with the PLO. We will no longer be able to hide our head in the sand again. Judging from the speeches and the contacts in between, the real delegation, the one sitting behind the scenes and holding the steering wheel, has a clear connection with the PLO.

Third, never before have Arabs and Israelis come so close and in such comprehensive groupings. By close, I mean sitting at the same table, and by comprehensive, I mean that many Arab delegates came at the same time to deal with a very serious issue indeed.

This conference has opened a door. It did not solve all the problems. Most of the problems are still ahead of us. The speeches were speeches. Not one was very brilliant. They were not bad. Some were more upsetting than others. To each his own. I was not surprised by the Syrian speech. The Syrians have always shown a kind of stubbornness.

[Reshef] Do you share the opinion that Shamir's speech was wise?

[Peres] It was good, I believe—mainly the historical review. All the participants avoided points of dispute, and all of them, naturally, addressed their home audiences as well as those sitting across the table from them. [passage omitted]

Peace Now—'Real Test' To Come Later

TA3110180991 Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in Hebrew 1700 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Text] In reaction to the speech made by the Palestinian representative at the Madrid conference, the Peace Now movement declared that the dialogue that had proved impossible in Israel had finally taken place. This was the first time that the Palestinian leadership and Israel's rulers were meeting face-to-face to state their cases.

Our correspondent Gil Litman reports that the Peace Now movement thinks that, although the speeches so far have been tough, they have not slammed any doors and that the real test will come at a later stage of the negotiations.

Activists Leave U.S. Consulate; Kahana Arrested

TA3110135891 Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in Hebrew 1300 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Text] Binyamin Ze'ev Kahana, the son of the late Rabbi Kahana, was arrested approximately one hour ago at the Husa Princesa Hotel in Madrid, where Prime Minister Yitzhaq Shamir is staying. Our correspondent Arye Golan reports that Binyamin Kahana entered the hotel holding a placard expressing opposition to the peace talks. Spanish security guards at the hotel arrested him at once, and he is currently being interrogated in one of the hotel rooms.

The four Kakh activists who occupied the U.S. Consulate in East Jerusalem have left the building after reaching an agreement with the acting consul that messages were to be sent to President Bush and to Secretary of State Baker. The messages are to include three demands posed by the Kakh movement: that the U.S. delegation cease all activity at the Madrid conference until the Syrian Jews are allowed to leave, that the United States play the role of a honest broker, and that the United States recognize Jerusalem as Israel's capital.

[Tel Aviv IDF Radio in Hebrew at 1300 GMT on 31 October adds that "the U.S. Consulate spokesman told our correspondent Asaf Ya'ari that they preferred not to lodge a complaint with the police, but to conclude the matter quietly."]

Ramallah 'Closed Military Zone' During Peace March

TA0111122291 Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in Hebrew 1200 GMT 1 Nov 91

[Text] Ramallah has been declared a closed military zone. A march for peace is currently organizing in town. Our correspondent Moti Amir reached the starting point for the march in the center of Ramallah, where youths were seen clutching olive branches. The deputy governor of Ramallah, on noticing the broadcasting van, immediately announced that Ramallah is a closed military zone, although all roads leading into Ramallah are open and no one prevented Qol Yisra'el's broadcasting van from reaching the city center. Our correspondent reports that the city is quiet and that it seems the security forces will escort the march so that it does not turn into a riot.

IDF—Over 7,000 Palestinians Detained, Imprisoned

TA0111100291 Tel Aviv HA'IR in Hebrew 1 Nov 91 pp 37, 38, 39

[Report by Bo'az Shapira]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] The IDF [Israel Defense Forces] spokesman has data on the number of Palestinian detainees.

How many Arabs are currently being held in detention centers and prisons on the eve of the Madrid conference?

The IDF spokesman says: At present, there are over 7,000 held in detention or in prisons. Nearly 5,000 of them have already been tried; the trials of 1,000 are in progress; and some 700 are awaiting trial. Of the total number of prisoners, 79 are under 16 years of age. [passage omitted]

Interview With King Husayn on Peace Talks

JN3110220891 Amman Jordan Television Network in Arabic 2104 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Interview with King Husayn in Amman "by reporters covering the Madrid peace conference" via satellite on 31 October—recorded; questions and answers in English with Arabic subtitles]

[Text] [Sami Haddad] Sir, this is the BBC Arabic Service-World Service, Sami Haddad. It seems that the bilateral negotiations between the Israelis and the Arabs are likely to start on Monday, this coming Monday. The Israelis are insisting that the next phase should take place in the Middle East—if not insisting, they are demanding. Will Jordan be prepared that such negotiations—the bilateral, the next phase—to take part in the Middle East?

[Husayn] I can only say in this context that this is new to us, and I believe that we should stress and put our efforts into substance rather than venues. This is a suggestion that has come up rather recently, and I think that it is inconvenient and rather difficult to visualize how one can have the preparations in place for anything like that within the very near future. I believe that the view is that the venue has been Madrid and Spain and we are very grateful and thankful to our Spanish brethren—King Juan Carlos, the government and people of Spain—for all their help and warm reception. I believe we should start there. It is early times to think of what next, and it is physically impossible in my view to look at the other option. Of course, this is my personal view, and it will have to be worked out between all concerned.

[Haddad] But Mr. Shamir in his speech today, sir, mentioned that if these negotiations are taking place in the Middle East they will be nearer to the policymakers who make decisions and this would make things easier and go faster.

[Husayn] Here I think that people are going around in circles. I would like, just as a person who has lived in this part of the world all these years and shouldered the responsibility has been involved in trying to secure a just and durable peace in this region for all its peoples, I believe that we are wasting a lot of time on trivialities and on new suggestions and new ideas. We have got something started. I know it is going to be difficult; I have always known it is going to be difficult. It is going to take time; it is going to take efforts. Let us not just keep changing from time to time by offering different suggestions and ideas at the expense of what is at stake.

And here I would like to address everybody there, all your colleagues who are present, and through you, hopefully, everyone in the world. I am talking about human beings now. In the world at large, they are watching this process, this beginning of an attempt to resolve a very chronic problem—one that has been with us for many, many years and the world as well, and through you I would like to address the men, the women, the children, the people in this region, on both sides of the divide. Please let us all work together, to ensure that the attempts to attain just, comprehensive, and durable peace are not lost. We cannot afford to have that.

[(Jan Cooly), ABC News] On regional problems, I realize that the question of arms control has been left for the third round of multilateral talks, but is it not true that with the proliferation of chemical, biological, and especially nuclear arms on both sides, the Arab-Israeli equation is becoming a very urgent danger and a very urgent threat to the area? And should this subject not be included in the very, very first real hard talks that take place? I am thinking of Israel's nuclear option, I am thinking of the weapons of mass destruction that have been accumulated on both sides.

[Husayn] I agree with you, and I think that the question of weapons of mass destruction and movement away following a conclusion of guarantees and commitments to remove them from this entire region as is happening in the world. [sentence as heard] Look, sir, what we see in the world is movement in a certain direction. We seem to be swimming upstream up to this point in time. It's about time we took into consideration everything that's happening in our universe, in this world, and to move with the times, to move to leave future generations something that is worthwhile—their security, their dignity, their humanity. Certainly weapons of mass destruction are an area that has to be addressed and addressed soon. But beyond the question of weapons, there are very, very urgent problems that are upon us almost—the question of water, the question of how do you put it together in this entire region, how do you move away from the area of confusion and uncertainty, and hatreds and fear and suspicions, how do you recreate, how do you create a better future for all generations to come within this entire region. I agree with you, sir, the weapons of mass destruction, and moving away from them, having to have the need for these weapons in any event or probably reducing arms within the region is a must. The question is not a question of accumulating arms anymore. It's a waste, it's a terrible waste. Enough deaths, enough losses, enough dangers not only to the region but to the world, and at the same time security. Security has to be something in the hearts and in the minds of people. And I hope that it is derived from an honorable, just, and, therefore, durable peace, and I hope that we are on our way towards it despite the rather difficult beginnings.

[Israeli radio reporter] Your Majesty, one last question from [name of indistinct] from the Israeli radio. First of all, I would like to greet you with peace, and I would like to express my wish to make a direct interview with you in Amman as soon as possible. I would like to ask you first of all: How do you envisage a future confederation between Jordan and the Palestinian would-be state? And second, do you think that President al-Asad is serious about wanting peace? Thank you.

[Husayn] I would like to hope and pray that everyone is serious about wanting peace—everybody concerned, everybody who is responsible in this entire region, and I have no reason to doubt the sincerity of President al-Asad in that regard. On the other hand, regarding the future, well, I hope that opportunities will be there for people to meet and to mix in conditions of peace and security, that all of us are hopefully trying to attain and achieve. Regarding the Palestinian-Jordanian relations, they are very, very close and very, very special. We in Jordan have been on the receiving end of every disaster that has been the fortune of our Palestinian brethren throughout the long and tragic history of this case so far. I believe that we are close together. I believe that we have a feeling that we have to rely on ourselves. I believe that there is a commitment towards building our future together, and the ties are certainly strong, and certainly even in this process, in this conference in particular, we began with the umbrella of a joint delegation of both peoples. Now regarding the future, I think it can be determined by a free people, by people who had a chance to express themselves. But I am sure that the ties are so strong and so real that something will be worked out, and hopefully it will be an example to many others in this area and in the world when that happens.

Radio Notes Contrasting Reactions to Peace Talks

JN2910125191 Paris Radio Monte Carlo in Arabic 1218 GMT 29 Oct 91

[Randah Habib dispatch from Amman]

[Text] On the eve of the peace conference, Jordanian newspapers today concentrated on what they termed a historic event. However, they admitted that the peace battle will be hard and tough.

In the meantime, several hundred students at al-Yarmuk University in Irbid demonstrated on the university campus in support of the peace conference, scheduled for tomorrow. They chanted national songs and raised slogans supporting peace and praising King Husayn's policy.

In an opposite move, Islamic students at Jordan University called for a strike and disruption of classes. They will consider tomorrow a day of national mourning to protest against the convening of the conference.

Yesterday, Monday, supporters and opponents of the peace conference clashed following an aborted speech rally organized by Islamic and leftist parties to protest the peace conference. Supporting and opposing voices were raised, after which verbal confrontation turned into physical fighting in which chairs were thrown and window panes were smashed.

In a statement to our radio, Information Minister Mahmud al-Sharif said everyone is entitled to express their own opinion as long as this is done peacefully and without undermining national security. Al-Sharif added that democracies throughout the world allow for differences of opinion and these differences sometimes develop into quarrels among disagreeing factions.

Disturbances at Anti-Conference Rally

JN2910082691 Amman AL-DUSTUR in Arabic 29 Oct 91 p 18

[Text] Amman—Organizers of a mammoth popular rally that was called for by professional and political forces at the Professional Association Complex were not successful in carrying out their rally yesterday. Beginning at 1700 yesterday, and even prior to the rally, the tension that would permeate the climate of the rally had become clear. At 1800 yesterday, with the participants entering the al-Rashid hall at the complex, two opposing voices began to assume control of the rally with their shouts and slogans, both against and in support of the Madrid peace conference. In light of this, the political parties organizing the rally deemed it impossible to continue with the meeting.

The organizers tried to control the situation without success, despite the fact that some wise people called for ending the rally. Some regrettable incidents took place which caused the glass of the al-Rashid hall to shatter. Some used chairs to attack each other, and the rest of the audience rushed out to escape injury.

Moments after this chaos, organizers of the rally tried once again to continue, but their attempts were unsuccessful.

In light of this situation, Deputy Layth Shubaylat called off the rally, noting that the opinion of the organizing forces will be made clear at a future news conference.

Police Chief Denies Rally 'Sabotaged'

JN3110100191 Amman JORDAN TIMES in English 31 Oct 91 p 2

["Special to the JORDAN TIMES" by Sana' 'Atiyah]

[Text] Amman—A senior security official Wednesday rejected accusations by several deputies that security forces had sabotaged a rally Monday which was to denounce the U.S.-Soviet sponsored Middle East peace conference.

Organisers of the rally, which included a number of Islamic and leftist groups, had accused "suspicious (security) elements" of aborting Monday's rally.

Chief of Police Major General Fadil 'Ali Fuhayd denied any security involvement in the rally and rejected accusations that police were involved in its disruption.

"Jordanians with differing positions came to the rally and expressed their views," Maj. Gen. 'Ali told the JORDAN TIMES in a telephone interview.

"But it seems they don't want to hear opposing views," he said, indicating that the opposers of the Madrid conference, which opened Wednesday, did not tolerate voices that supported it.

The rally was disrupted when a group of youth started to chant pro-peace slogans, which ended up with violence, overturned chairs and broken windows. Deputies who were scheduled to give their anti-peace conference speeches postponed the rally to an unknown date and asked the participants to vacate the hall of the Professional Association Complex.

Gen. 'Ali accused the Muslim Brotherhood movement, who took part in organising the rally, of using the security forces as an excuse to prevent other opinions from being voiced.

"The Brotherhood should not use the security forces as an excuse to silence the voice of others," he stressed. He said that police did not interfere in the rally except "to keep the peace."

In a statement issued after the aborted rally, the organisers accused the authorities were purposely "suppressing the voice and will of the people."

Independent Islamic Deputy Layth Shubaylat earlier Wednesday invited the press to watch an amateur videotape of the events that occurred at Monday's rally to "prove that we are being provoked by suspicious infiltrators to sabotage it."

The 45-minute unedited tape showed a group of around 30 youth interrupting a shaykh who was reciting verses from the Holy Koran as they chanted pro-peace slogans.

As chairs were overturned and windows broken by youth, Mr. Shubaylat was seen asking the participants to calmly leave the hall. Around a dozen riot police were then seen entering the hall, but the film did not depict any interference on their part.

"The attempt by the infiltrators to sabotage the rally was under police protection," Mr. Shubaylat commented to a group watching the TV screen in his Amman office, including Muslim Brotherhood deputies.

The tape then showed the group of youth joining others outside the building, during which they staged a brief pro-peace demonstration. A participant at the rally told the JORDAN TIMES that the youth had thrown stones at the participants as they left the building. A while later, a policeman was heard asking the youth to disperse.

Mr. Shubaylat accused the authorities of "hypocrisy" for allowing the youth to continue in their demonstration, saying that "the authorities told us parliamentarians that we could not have a congregation because they were banned."

"But the irony is that they allowed this group to congregate," he said.

Student Strike Turns Into Pro-Peace Rally

JN0111055091 Amman JORDAN TIMES in English 31 Oct 91 p 3

["Special to the JORDAN TIMES" by Sirin Halasah]

[Text] Amman—A student strike and rally at the University of Jordan called for by Islamic movements Wednesday on the eve of the Middle East peace conference opening in Madrid turned out to be an event in support of the historic Arab-Israeli encounter in the Spanish capital.

The strike, organised by student supporters of the Muslim Brotherhood, was stumped when another group of students worked against the event and staged a counter-demonstration, including a sit-in, in support of His Majesty King Husayn and Jordan's participation in the peace conference.

An eyewitness who refused to be identified said that some Islamic students tried to prevent professors from giving lectures by locking the doors of the lecture halls from the inside, barging in during the lecture, reciting the Koran and urging students to follow their call and join the strike.

The eyewitness also said that opponents and proponents of the peace conference clashed briefly at the university's main square. There were no immediate reports of injuries.

Students supporting the current peace efforts later held a sit-in in the main square, holding Jordanian flags and olive branches and chanting peace slogans.

"We support King Husayn on every level nationally and internationally, and we believe that Jordan should not isolate itself from the Arab ranks and should join a peace process that is based on international legitimacy," said 'Adil Hamayidah, a law student at the university.

Undeterred, Islamist students later issued a statement claiming that the strike took place in the following departments: engineering, agriculture, sciences, shari'a, medicine, and pharmacy. The statement said the strike was not successful in the business, law and literature departments.

It was the second time in three days that an anti-peace conference event organised by Islamists failed to materialise.

On Monday, a rally organised by Islamist deputies, the Brotherhood and mostly leftist factions was aborted when violence erupted between supporters and opponents of the Madrid talks.

Although Muslim Brotherhood officials say their popularity among the public remains intact, analysts and observers contend that support for the group's opposition to the Madrid peace conference is declining.

"If what these analysts say is true then the government would not prevent the other side from expressing their opposing point of view," said Ziyad Abu-Ghanimah, a senior official of the Brotherhood.

Mr. Abu-Ghanimah said this in reference to the violence that aborted Monday's rally. "I think what happened at the rally is a stupid idiotic try to fake Jordanian public opinion," he contended.

Mr. Abu-Ghanimah insisted that his movement was being "provoked by certain elements," but vowed that they would not give up their opposition to the peace process.

"Nothing, not even death, will prevent us from voicing our views and opposition to the peace conference," he told the JORDAN TIMES in a telephone interview. "We will hold on to our views and voice them peacefully and without any violence."

Mr. Abu-Ghanimah referred to an earlier press conference by Ahmad Qutaysh al-Azayidah in which the Muslim Brotherhood movement pledged to continue to oppose any settlement with Israel through peaceful means.

Mustafa Hamarinah, a history professor at the University of Jordan, said public support for opposition groups might be slipping. Many people, he said, are waiting to see the results of the peace conference.

Also, there is a growing segment of the population that, while not fully supporting the current peace drive, sees no alternative being presented by the Muslim Brotherhood or any other opposition party.

"There is a feeling among the people that the Muslim fundamentalists are not giving other alternatives and are not convincing in their opposition," Dr. Hamarnah said.

Commentaries on Opening Speeches at Madrid Conference

SAWT-SHA'B Editorial

JN3110133791 Amman SAWT AL-SHA'B in Arabic 31 Oct 91 pp 1, 15

[Editorial: "International Legitimacy Prevails at Madrid Conference"]

[Text] The speeches delivered by Presidents Bush and Gorbachev and the representative of the European Community at the opening of the Madrid conference yesterday show that the resolutions of international legitimacy, the principle of land for peace, the Palestinian people's national rights, and the cessation of settlements were clearly imposed on the atmosphere of the conference and on the winds of the peace movement that surrounded Shamir. This situation has placed two difficult options in front of Shamir: either to respond to the will of the international community, or to swim against the torrential current of peace.

Despite the soft and convenient diplomatic language used by Bush, Gorbachev, and the EC representative, the direct and indirect dimensions, meanings, hints, and indications contained in their speeches indicate that there is a real and earnest American, Soviet, and European desire to achieve a peaceful settlement. They also indicate that there is a collective conviction that the resolutions of international legitimacy, including Resolutions 242 and 338, represent a basic reference to the negotiations between the Arab parties, including the Palestinian side, on the one hand, and the Israeli party on the other.

In his speech on behalf of the European Community, the Netherlands foreign minister dotted the i's in terms of underscoring international legitimacy and the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people.

It is worth noting that the issue of settlement building in the occupied territory encompassed a large part of the concern of the participants in the Madrid conference. It was noticed that there was unanimity that the building of settlements constitutes an obstacle on the path of peace. The Egyptian foreign minister, who is leading his country's delegation to Madrid, believes that settlement building is a move to devour the occupied Arab territory.

This issue practically constitutes a stumbling block to the possibility of reaching a just and peaceful solution. In his statement yesterday to the British ITN, His Majesty King Husayn said that this issue constitutes a direct threat to the peace process.

In any case, the Arab parties, including the Palestinian side, have pinned great hope on the possibility of rendering the peace conference a success. They hope that the U.S. and Soviet Administrations, as well as the European Community, will play an effective and influential role in convincing the Israelis of the need to honor the resolutions of international legitimacy. As King Husayn said, the Madrid conference might be the last attempt to deal with the root causes of the Arab-Israeli conflict and the Palestine question in the region.

AL-RA'Y Editorial

JN0111123791 Amman AL-RA'Y in Arabic 31 Oct 91 pp 1, 23

[Editorial: "The Will of Peace"]

[Text] Yesterday was the first day of the peace conference. At the opening session, speeches were delivered by the prime minister of the host country, Spain, and by Presidents Bush and Gorbachev, the Netherlands foreign minister and EC representative, and the Egyptian foreign minister. It is worth noting that the four speeches delivered after the Spanish prime minister's address were unanimous in calling for the consideration of UN Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338 as a basis for negotiations. They were also unanimous in calling for respecting the Palestinian people's right to self-determination. President Bush deemed it wise to mention his 6 March initiative in a clear allusion that the peace conference is the outcome of this initiative.

It is also noticed that the EC was eager to focus on the land-for-peace principle, in addition to Resolutions 242 and 338, and to remind us that international legitimacy implemented in the Gulf is worth implementing everywhere. The EC also clearly referred to Arab Jerusalem as part of the occupied Arab territory, and to the settlements as an obstacle to peace, and called for an end to the settlement activity.

Moreover, it should be noted that the EC stressed that it is a partner in the peace process and that it is close to the negotiators. This means that although it is not a cosponsor of the conference with the United States and the Soviet Union, it does occupy the position of an active partner and not the position of an observer.

The Egyptian foreign minister's speech was clearer and focused more on the call for Israel's withdrawal from all occupied Arab territories, including Arab Jerusalem. The speech stressed non-recognition of the resolution by which Israel annexed Jerusalem. The speech also included a strong warning that the international resolutions and commitments imposed by international law should not be an object of negotiations and bargaining. Instead, negotiations should be devoted to drawing up formulas to implement resolutions and commitments and to provide their requirements. The speech also responded to the Israeli slogan of peace for peace and made it clear that even when dealing with this slogan it must mean rights for rights and commitments for commitments. The speech did not forget to stress that the settlements are illegal and violate international law and the Geneva conventions.

Thus, the inaugural session of the peace conference was an international forum at which there was international consensus urging Israel to abide by international legitimacy, represented by Resolutions 242 and 338, as well as the land-for-peace principle. The session, therefore, has turned into an international political mechanism which asserted its presence and expressed an international consensus that failure to abide by these two resolutions and this principle will be an unforgivable deviation from peace.

The signs observed during this session call for satisfaction. If Israel is made to understand these signs and to realize the persistent international desire to establish a just and comprehensive peace in the region, then this will give a push forward to the negotiation process without delay. However, all expectations indicate that this process will be long and tough because of Israel's intransigence. Hence, the intransigent ones will finally find themselves face to face with the will of peace in which the entire world believes. This international will will not tolerate any rebellion against it in our region.

King, European Parliament President Meet 31 Oct

JN3110185691 Amman Radio Jordan Network in Arabic 1600 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Text] At al-Nadwah Palace this afternoon, His Majesty King Husayn received European Parliament President Enrique Baron Crespo and his delegation. They talked about the ongoing Madrid peace conference and the prospects for peace in the Middle East, stressing the importance of the European role in promoting the Middle East peace process. They also discussed relations between Jordan and Europe and looked into ways to develop them. His Majesty King Husayn expressed his satisfaction with the progress of these ties.

The president of the European Parliament said Europe cared about Jordan and supported and appreciated Jordan and His Majesty King Husayn and his advocacy of a just and comprehensive peace in the region.

The meeting was attended by His Highness Crown Prince Hasan, Prime Minister Tahir al-Masri, Royal Court Chief al-Sharif Zayd bin-Shakir, Senator Ahmad 'Ubaydat, his majesty's political adviser 'Adnan Abu-'Awdah, and his majesty's military secretary His Highness Prince Talal bin-Muhammad.

Crown Prince Says Regional Issues Directly Linked

JN3110063491 Amman JORDAN TIMES in English 30 Oct 91 pp 1, 2

[Report on interview with Crown Prince Hassan by Mexican television; place and date not given]

[Text] Amman (J.T.)—His Royal Highness Crown Prince Hassan Tuesday emphasized the importance of talks on regional issues among the various parties in the Middle East and said there cannot be any circumventing of the direct linkage among the regional issues.

The Crown Prince, in an interview with Mexican Television, also voiced appreciation for the U.S. initiative which led to the Middle East peace conference, which opens in Madrid Wednesday.

"This is not the time to raise slogans (or) to be emotional," the Crown Prince said. "It is time to express our appreciation for the sponsorship of this conference, in particular, the U.S. initiative of March of this year which we feel was a principal initiative in that it emphasised the importance of land for peace," the Crown Prince told interviewer Alka Ben Reza [name as published].

"It is also a time to remind the world that those who are participating in this conference are clearly there to promote moderation and to promote a search for common ground based on communitive interest," he said.

At the same time, the Crown Prince warned, "if this exercise is to be aborted, then clearly we will not be engaged in a process which we all seek, but we will have given the opportunity to those who, expecting and anticipating a failure of this political exercise, to say 'there you are, we told you so. The positions are too intransigent, nothing will change and it will not be a case of land for peace or peace for peace but peace in place as we know is no peace at all." [quotation marks as published]

In reply to a question on regional talks, the Crown Prince said:

"Let me first take in terms of direct linkage the question of the multilateral talks, which we feel very strongly are extremely important in that they represent in a sense a Helsinki process for the Middle East. In terms of energy, water, and the consumption of water, there is direct linkage. In terms of debt and military expenditure, there is direct linkage. This is transnational thinking. It goes across borders and consequently when one looks at the case of Israel, in the context, for example, of water, Israel is a low riparian of water, we are a middle riparian and Syria is an upper riparian, and, if you will, Turkey is an upper riparian to Syria. So there is direct linkage on the most explosive issue potentially, which is drinking water.

"But of course if you are asking me about the direct political talks: Will they lead to cumulative achievements? Clearly, as has been said, some delegations will make progress than others, but what we are looking for is not a peace in aggregate or peace in cumulative achievements. What we, and I say we as Arabs, are looking for, is a comprehensive and just peace and think that every indication today is that the cause of the Palestinian people will be honoured and promoted by active Arab inter-action."

Karami Clarifies Stand on Madrid Talks

NC2910112791 (Clandestine) Radio Free Lebanon in Arabic 0945 GMT 29 Oct 91

[Excerpt] Lebanon's participation in the peace conference to convene in Madrid tomorrow has been the subject of discussion between the Chamber of Deputies' plenary session and the government.

Prime Minister 'Umar Karami delivered a speech in which he said Lebanon is taking part in the peace conference proceeding from three firm national and pan-Arab considerations, which are: first, to continue the official Lebanese policy which supports convening a general and comprehensive peace conference for the Middle East; second, for the sake of Arab solidarity and Lebanon's commitment to Arab causes; and third, the conference is convening under the banner of peace, not capitulation, and to implement Resolutions 242 and 338 and find a just peace for the Middle East crisis.

On Israel's withdrawal from the south, Prime Minister Karami said Lebanon has stressed that this subject falls within the limits of Security Council Resolution 425, which stipulates the need for Israel's withdrawal without any conditions or restrictions. He adds: Despite Lebanese efforts, this resolution still has not been implemented. This is what has made us stress the need for implementing Resolution 425 without linking it to the peace conference or its results.

Prime Minister Karami also stressed the need for affirming Lebanon's international borders and not linking the Israeli and Syrian withdrawals to each other. He also stressed the need for a just and comprehensive peace. In a message to the Americans, Prime Minister Karami said he had asked for clarifications on the issue of bilateral and multilateral negotiations. He pointed out that the Americans clarified these points. They highlighted the need for making a distinction between Resolution 425 on the one hand and the crisis in the region and the peace conference results on the other. The United States also affirmed its support for Lebanon's independence and full sovereignty and for the al-Ta'if agreement.

Prime Minister Karami said that after the government studied the U.S. letter, it responded with remarks confirming Lebanon's stand.

On stages defined for the peace conference program, Prime Minister Karami pointed out that as regards the issue of bilateral sessions with Israel, Lebanese negotiations will be confined to the implementation of Resolution 425. Regarding multilateral negotiations, Prime Minister Karami pointed out that Lebanon will not participate until progressive results are attained.

Prime Minister Karami affirmed that resistance in the south will continue as long as the Israeli Army is on Lebanese territory. He affirmed that the Lebanese Army is capable of keeping the peace along the Lebanese-Israeli border. [passage omitted]

Country's Water 'Not for Sale'

NC2710165091 Beirut Radio Lebanon in Arabic 1200 GMT 27 Oct 91

[Interview with Prime Minister 'Umar Karami by an unidentified World Spanish News Network correspondent; place and date not given—recorded]

[Text] [Correspondent] Mr. Prime Minister: On the eve of the peace conference, what is Lebanon seeking to achieve by participating?

[Karami] Since the beginning of the Palestinian problem, which has generated problems for all Arab states bordering on Palestinian territory, Lebanon has believed in peace, not any peace but peace based on justice, on peoples' right to self-determination, and on international legitimacy. Lebanon decided to participate in the peace conference because it supports these principles. An important part of Lebanon is occupied by Israel. The UN Security Council issued Resolution 425 in 1978 [as heard], calling for Israel's unconditional withdrawal from Lebanese territory to internationally recognized borders. Israel has procrastinated. In all its talks with the United States, Lebanon has sought to clarify that there is no room for negotiations on the principle of withdrawal and the implementation of the resolution. Israel must submit to international legitimacy and unconditionally withdraw from Lebanese territory to a line behind internationally recognized borders. Lebanon is going to the peace conference on this basis. Of course, Lebanon has an Arab dimension. There are Arab states which will also go to the peace conference, and Lebanon is committed to Arab rights based on international legitimacy. Lebanon is committed to the Palestinian issue and the Palestinian people's right to self-determination.

[Correspondent] Mr. Prime Minister, it has been said that the issue of (?the sale of) Lebanese water will be discussed at the conference. Do you have any comment?

[Karami] We always hear and read about Lebanese water in the media. We want to say—and I said it yesterday at the Arab lawyers conference—that Lebanon cannot concede any of its territory or one drop of its water. Lebanon needs every drop. It is not for sale; it is not a bargaining chip. Lebanon has tried to utilize its water for drinking and irrigation, but Israel has attacked each project. All our studies show Lebanon needs all its water.

[Correspondent] Mr. Prime Minister, how far did coordination among frontline states go?

[Karami] The Lebanese minister at the frontline states' meeting in Damascus yesterday briefed me on the discussions and decisions that were made. It was natural for this meeting to take place before a conference that we regard as a great historical crossroads. They coordinated positions that are based on inalienable rights.

[Correspondent] As part of the coordination, was there a special [words indistinct] point they agreed affecting Lebanon?

[Karami] Lebanon's position, as we have already said, is clear and frank. All the Arab states and the world support this position based on Resolution 425. Lebanon's issue is the easiest; its cause is clear and does not even require experts. During bilateral talks at the conference, Lebanon will have very little to say, simply: Please implement Resolution 425. For the other Arab states, the main principle is land for peace. UN Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338 will form the basis for negotiations. Lebanon, of course, will support the Arab states' rights and demands.

[Correspondent] Mr. Prime Minister, it has been reported that Lebanon handed U.S. Ambassador Ryan Crocker its response to the U.S. letter of assurances. Could you brief us on this?

[Karami] These letters have not been published, but I can assure you the U.S. letter of assurances has been carefully studied. We have made sure all points on Lebanese rights are clear, unequivocal, and with no room for ambiguity. Our response, representing the Lebanese Government's position, and which we sent along with our acceptance of the peace conference invitation, stresses that Lebanon will not budge from any of its declared positions or rights. The U.S. ambassador sent the letter to his government.

[Correspondent] Did the Lebanese response stress what the press has mentioned; that is, separating Security Council Resolution 425 from the Middle East issue?

[Karami] We are [words indistinct] of the need to separate the Lebanese issue, calling for it long ago. During the peace conference all Middle East issues will be discussed. As I told you, our issue is much simpler and clearer, not even needing negotiation. We have nothing to discuss with the Israelis other than to ask them to implement the resolution. If the conference fails, God forbid, we will have lost nothing on Resolution 425. Lebanon will continue to ask for its question to be separated from the Middle East issue and for Israel to withdraw from its territory.

[Correspondent] How do you view Tehran's opposition to the peace conference, particularly since there are reports of possible bilateral negotiations between Lebanon and Israel. How could you link these various issues?

[Karami] There is historic enmity between Israel and the Arab nation and Islam on Jerusalem, a holy city to all religions. All Muslims are concerned with this issue. Continued Israeli aggression, arrogance, and defiance have created enmity between Zionism and the Arab and Islamic nation, which is not as easy to eliminate as quickly as certain people imagine. We understand why many Tehran or Arab parties reject it. The peace conference will be a touchstone for Israel. The conference will be justified if it accepts the resolutions of international legitimacy and withdrawal from the Arab territories. It would achieve through peace what war has failed to achieve. We have always maintained that national resistance is legitimate while one inch of Lebanese territory is occupied. This is a right recognized by international legitimacy, human rights and by all states, including those who have had to liberate their own countries by resistance. Convening the peace conference cannot warrant stopping the resistance. What counts is the outcome.

[Correspondent] What would you like to say to the Spanish Television Network on the eve of the conference?

[Karami] Lebanon, small in size but big in its presence, legitimacy, civilization, and status in the Middle East, has been a victim of a stubborn and long conflict in the region for 16 years. Lebanon has borne a lot to preserve its rights and well being, Arab rights and dignity. Lebanon goes to the peace conference armed with a great history of struggle and determination to preserve its rights, independence, sovereignty, and dignity, and to support Arab rights to the hilt. We go to a conference of peace, not capitulation. If we feel any pressure or infringement on our rights or dignity, we will not stay. We hope the conference will succeed so that peace may prevail in the region and there is prosperity and justice for all parties.

Chamber of Deputies Speaker on Madrid Talks

NC3010131291 Beirut Radio Lebanon in Arabic 0530 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Statement by Chamber of Deputies Speaker Husayn al-Husayni, followed by responses to questions by unidentified correspondents after he met with President Ilyas al-Hiraqi and Prime Minister 'Umar Karami in Beirut on 29 Oct—recorded]

[Text] [Al-Husayni] Following his excellency the president's return from abroad, it was our duty to congratulate him on his safe homecoming. He briefed us on his visits to France, Italy, and the Vatican, while we informed him of domestic developments, particularly this morning's Chamber of Deputies' meeting which debated Lebanon's stand on the Madrid conference.

[Correspondent] Mr. Speaker, on the eve of the peace conference, southern Lebanon is experiencing [word indistinct] military operations. [Words indistinct] to the conference and Resolution 425?

[Al-Husayni] Resolution 425 was adopted after Israel invaded our territory in 1978. There is no room for it at the Madrid conference, which is a response to a general call and convening on the basis of Resolutions 242 and 338. We must explain: We are engaged in a peace process in Lebanon and our participation at this conference is part of that. Our desire for peace is clear and is shown by our participation in the conference. It is based on our commitment to the general Arab stand, the Palestinian people's rights, and Lebanon hosting a large number of Palestinians. This conference is expected to decide the displaced Palestinians' fate.

For these reasons we are participating in the conference convening on Resolutions 242 and 338, dealing with the Israeli occupation of the Arab territories in 1967 and the October 1973 war—matters with which we have no direct connection. Because we are concerned with the peace issue as a whole we are following events; thus we are not surprised by events in the south. We draw the attention of the United States and President Bush, who often pledged to support the text and spirit of the al-Ta'if agreement, to Israel's clear anti-peace intentions, shown by its movements in the south and its opposition to Resolution 425; the [words indistinct] Israel's intentions, as to whether it wants peace or not. Personally, I am convinced Israel is against peace, historically and in practice.

[Correspondent] Mr. Speaker, do you want to say through your statement that Israel does not want peace? This is known.

[al-Husayni] Yes, this is known. Of course.

[Correspondent] [Words indistinct] optimism about the Madrid conference?

[al-Husayni] We adhere to resolving Lebanon's crisis apart from the region's; the Casablanca conference resolution is clear on this, as are the Arab Tripartite Committee and the al-Ta'if agreements, our national charter, the international community, and U.S. commitment. That is what we are asking to be implemented.

[Correspondent] Mr. Speaker, [words indistinct] the water issue at the peace conference. What is Lebanon's stand?

[al-Husayni] Lebanon has nothing to negotiate, even the water issue. Its water springs from Lebanon and flows into Lebanon. Nobody has any international rights on Lebanese territory.

[Correspondent] [Question indistinct]

[al-Husayni] Everybody knows that the 17 May agreement has died and we have put [words indistinct] on its tomb.

'Nothing To Negotiate With Israel'

NC0111105691 Beirut Voice of Lebanon in Arabic 1015 GMT 1 Nov 91

[Excerpt] Chamber Speaker Husayn al-Husayni has said that Lebanon has nothing to negotiate with Israel at the bilateral level, stating: We are not practicing one-upmanship against Arabs when we say that we do not want to meet with the Israelis. What we are insisting on is the implementation of Resolution 425.

Al-Husayni added that reports about problems between him and Prime Minister 'Umar Karami will harm Lebanon. These kinds of reports have no effect on us whatsoever, he said.

The speaker gave a news conference in his home, which ended a short while ago. He said it is absolutely not in Lebanon's interest to undermine its status, and he stressed that absolving the American side of its responsibilities would be wrong. I do not believe that we have anything to gain from doing this, he said. [passage omitted]

Shiite Cleric Scores Madrid Conference Delegates

NC0111112291 (Clandestine) Voice of the Oppressed in Arabic to Lebanon 0630 GMT 1 Nov 91

[Text] [Shiite cleric] His Eminence Shaykh Muhammad Yazbik marked the one-week anniversary of the martyrdom of Husayn Murad, Bilal Taha, and 'Ali Midlij by saying that the Madrid conferees cannot make any decision on the Palestinians. Only those who carry the sword of Islam, refuse to recognize the usurper entity, and reject the presence of the Zionist enemy on the lands of Palestine can make these decisions, he added. The sons of the stones are entitled to make these decisions, not kings or presidents who are exploiting the issues for their own benefit.

We have to justify the confidence of the Islamic leadership and Muslim custodian Sayyid 'Ali Khamene'i, may the Almighty preserve him, his eminence said, adding: The nation which marched in Beirut yesterday to mark the day of wrath and voice their rejection of the Madrid conference will not retreat; it will take up the struggle until all Palestine is returned. Israel wants to feel comfortable by normalizing relations with its neighbors, Yazbik said. He added that through the arms of the faithful we will make Israel live in fear, and the hands that give up Palestine will be cut off.

His eminence called on everyone to rise to the occasion to confront the enemy and criticized the conspirators who are meeting under the U.S. and Israeli flags, even while Israel continues building settlements. It is a shame for them to speak on behalf of Palestine, he said, while the camps are being subjected to spiteful Zionist bombardment every day.

What kind of peace, he asked, are they talking about when Israel wants us to recognize it before any dialogue? He said that Israel wants to negotiate with Lebanon along the lines of the 17 May agreement, which was abolished by the strong Muslim fists and blood.

We say to all those who engage in a dialogue with Israel that we will never forget the blood of Muhammad Najdi and that the Islamic resistance is there to abort the schemes being designed against this nation, he said. Those conspirators are opportunistic; all they care about is pleasing Washington.

Spanish Consulate in Sidon Hit by Missile

NC0111061691 Tehran Voice of the Islamic Republic of Iran First Program Network in English 1130 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Text] Spain's consulate in Sidon, south Lebanon, was hit by a missile and sustained losses yesterday in protest of the U.S. peace conference. According to IRNA, following the attack the employees of the consulate removed the country's flag from the facade. This comes at a time when tough security measures have been taken and the Lebanese army has established numerous posts around the U.S. Embassy in the eastern part of Beirut.

Threatening Call Received 29 Nov

NC0111063291 Tehran Voice of the Islamic Republic of Iran First Program Network in Urdu 1230 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Text] Police sources in Beirut have reported that the Spanish consulate in Lebanon has received telephone threats and that security has been stepped up around the consulate. According to AFP, an unidentified caller had threatened the Spanish consulate on 29 October. It is being reported that in view of the protests against the U.S.-brokered peace conference in Madrid, most of the Western and Arab embassies are in danger.

U.S. Said Training Groups To Nab Hostage-Takers

NC0111105991 Beirut AL-SHIRA' in Arabic 21 Oct 91 p 8

[Text] The Americans at the U.S. Embassy in Beirut are training Lebanese armed groups to kidnap a number of Lebanese people accused of kidnapping and assassinating foreigners in Lebanon and abroad.

The group is led by a person from a family living in the al- Biqa', who has received training in special operations. This has aroused the concern of the kidnappers of the foreign hostages held in Lebanon, who have asked the envoy of UN Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar for personal guarantees before releasing the remaining foreign hostages held in Lebanon.

Hostage Captors Concerned Over Possible Reprisals

NC0111114891 Beirut AL-SHIRA' in Arabic 28 Oct 91 p 7

[Text] The personal guarantees the abductors of the foreign hostages in Lebanon have requested from the United Nations to accelerate the hostages' release have not yet been provided. Therefore, the abductors are worried about possible attacks of revenge against them by a security-military team the United States is training. AL-SHIRA' last week noted the existence of such a team.

A source knowledgeable about the background developments of the hostage crisis has disclosed this. The source, however, mentioned that these considerations have not affected the prospects for the release of the hostages. It seems, the source said, that these considerations will not affect the future of this issue, which has been placed on the "front burner."

Hizballah Reportedly Holding Canadian Since 1985

NC2610071291 Beirut Voice of Lebanon in Arabic 0615 GMT 26 Oct 91

[Text] It has been disclosed for the first time that Henriette Haddad, a 64-year-old Canadian woman of Lebanese origin, has been held hostage by Hizballah since 1985. The Canadian Ministry of External Afffairs was informed in 1985 of Mrs. Haddad's disappearance, but the ministry advised her family to keep silent so as not to compromise the diplomatic efforts to secure her release.

It seems that her son, Constantine Haddad, decided to break the silence after six years. He said that his mother is being held by Hizballah and that he has asked the Canadian Government to exert efforts to secure her release. She was taken hostage when she visited Lebanon in 1985.

The issue was discussed at the House of Commons in Ottawa. A Liberal Party member of parliament accused the government of doing nothing to secure the Canadian hostage's release.

Nicole Martel, a spokeswoman for the Canadian External Affairs Ministry, explained that the Canadian Government has asked Iran to intercede to secure the release of the hostage although it has no evidence that she is being held by Hizballah.

More Hostages To Be Released 'Very Shortly'

NC3110175191 Beirut Voice of Lebanon in Arabic 1730 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Text] A Lebanese political source told REUTER today that pro-Iranian hostage captors will release more hostages despite Tehran's strong opposition to the Madrid conference. The source, who has just returned from talks with officials in Tehran, said that the Madrid conference and the intransigent position against it by Iran and the fundamentalist Islamists will not hamper efforts to end the hostage crisis. On the contrary, the source said, it will expedite the current process and more hostages will be released very shortly.

'New Steps' Said Imminent

PM3010164591 London AL-HAYAH in Arabic 29 Oct 91 p 2

[Unattributed report: "Another Hostage Expected To Be Released in Return for 'Ubayd's Release"]

[Excerpt] Beirut, AL-HAYAH—A prominent ministerial source has revealed that new steps are likely to take place in the coming hours concerning the release of another Western hostage in return for the release of a batch of the Lebanese prisoners held in Israeli jails, among them a Hizballah leader, Shaykh 'Abd-al-Karim.

The ministerial source, who is familiar with the current contacts in this regard, expected further relaxations at the level of the release of other Western hostages and that a new operation may take place in the next hours, namely by releasing one of two: the American Terry Anderson or the Briton Terry Waite.

The ministerial source added that the new element at this level concerns Israel's initiative to release a third batch of Lebanese prisoners, and that that batch might be confined to the release of an important figure like Shaykh 'Abd-al-Karim 'Ubayd, provided that an important Western hostage is released in return. [passage omitted]

Iran Said Ready To Withdraw Guard Members

NC0111113391 Beirut AL-SHIRA' in Arabic 21 Oct 91 p 9

[Text] Despite the statement by the Iranian Revolutionary Guard in which it denied the possibility of withdrawing between 1,000 and 1,500 of its members from Lebanon, an informed source has stated that Iran has affirmed that it will not obstruct this withdrawal. It conveyed this position to General Hikmat al-Shihabi [Syrian chief of staff] and then to Foreign Minister Faris Buwayz, affirming that it will do as they see fit. Iran emphasized that "we are prepared to do what you want, but we advise you that it is in no one's interest at this time to talk about this issue (the issue of the withdrawal of the Revolutionary Guard), because Israel will not withdraw from the south."

Overnight Attacks on South; Resistance on Alert

NC0111080591 (Clandestine) Voice of the Oppressed in Arabic to Lebanon 0630 GMT 1 Nov 91

[Text] The Israeli occupation forces have continued their aggression against areas in southern Lebanon. According to reports, the city of al-Nabatiyah came under concentrated artillery attacks last night from the occupation troops' positions inside the occupied border strip.

The city of al-Nabatiyah had been coming under artillery bombardment since yesterday morning. The village of Habbush also was subjected to shelling, which caused property damage but no casualties. The occupation troops maintained their bombardment along a line parallel to the occupied strip to prevent any anti- Israeli operations.

According to reports, tension prevails in the south as a result of the Israeli escalation. Meanwhile, the Islamic resistance has declared a state of alert.

Further on Shelling; al-Nabatiyah Deserted

NC0111130091 Beirut Radio Lebanon in Arabic 1225 GMT 1 Nov 91

[Excerpt] According to the latest security reports, the shelling in the south resumed at 0900 today. The shelling was directed against al-Nabatiyah, Zawtar al-Sharqiyah, Zawtar al- Gharbiyah, Habbush, Habbush Bridge, 'Arab Salim, and al-Wadi al- Akhdar. Al-Nabatiyah, Jarju', 'Ayn bu Siwar, and Jba' came under heavy artillery fire at 1700 yesterday. The NATIONAL NEWS AGENCY correspondent in the south said that al-Nabatiyah has become completely deserted. [passage omitted]

15 Wounded

NC0111133391 (Clandestine) Voice of the Mountain in Arabic to Lebanon 1230 GMT 1 Nov 91

[Excerpts] The Israeli acts of aggression against the villages in the al-Nabatiyah district continue. After the overnight artillery shelling of the region, the occupation army's artillery resumed bombardment of al-Nabatiyah city as of 1030 today, from positions on 'Ali al-Tahir and al-Suwayda' hills. [passage omitted]

A civil defense source in the south told our radio that 15 people were wounded by today's shelling and were taken to al-Janub, Ghandur, and al-Najdah al-Sha'biyah hospitals in al-Nabatiyah. In another development, a Red Cross convoy carrying food entered the villages of Yuhmur, in al-Shaqif area, and Armun.

Syria's Khaddam Arrives; Holds News Briefing

JN3110203191 Damascus Syrian Arab Television Network in Arabic 1840 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Text] Vice President 'Abd-al-Halim Khaddam arrived in Beirut at 1210 today and held a meeting with Lebanese President Ilyas al-Hirawi. Later, Prime Minister 'Umar Karami and Defense Minister Michel al-Murr joined the meeting. President al-Hirawi hosted a luncheon banquet in honor of the vice president that was also attended by Chamber of Deputies Speaker Husayn al-Husayni.

At the conclusion of his meeting with the Lebanese president, the speaker of the Chamber of Deputies, and the prime minister, Vice President 'Abd-al-Halim Khaddam held a news conference, during which he answered reporters' questions.

[Begin recording] [Unidentified reporter] Your Excellency, you held lengthy talks today with the president, the prime minister, and the speaker of the Chamber of Deputies. The first meeting was held with his excellency the president. What can you tell us about these meetings?
[Khaddam] Within the framework of the coordination and consultations existing between the two countries, it is only natural for us to visit Beirut to meet with his excellency the president upon his return from his European tour and to congratulate him on his safe return. His excellency the president informed me of the contacts he held in France and Italy. We also discussed the topical event, the peace conference. We reviewed what has transpired thus far. Our analyses of the developments that have taken place were in agreement. Similarly, we drew the same conclusions in this regard.

[Reporter] There is a debate going on regarding participation in the bilateral negotiations after the Madrid conference has been inaugurated. This debate is going on here in Lebanon. What is your opinion on this?
[Khaddam] If we are to analyze the stands of the two parties engaged in this debate, then we would find that their positions are one and the same. The Lebanese Government, as we are all aware, is of the opinion that the Lebanese delegation was entrusted with going to Madrid to discuss the

implementation of Resolution 425. All parties agree on this resolution. Consequently, the debate on a phrase here or there is not important. What is important for the two parties engaged in the debate is that the Lebanese delegation will discuss the implementation of Resolution 425, considering that the Israeli occupation of southern Lebanon must be separated from the Arab-Israeli conflict. There is a Lebanese consensus on this.

[Reporter] Your Excellency, what are your impressions regarding the speech delivered by Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhaq Shamir at the conference today, the speech in which he maintained that the peace conference will not make progress as long as efforts focus exclusively on exchanging land for peace?
[Khaddam] Shamir's speech provides nothing new. He accurately expressed the hostile Zionist policy, which is based on the acquisition of territory, expansion, the construction of more settlements, and the displacement of more Arab residents. He clearly presented this policy. Hence, it was not a surprise to us.

[Reporter] If these things are maintained, will this cause Syria to walk out of the conference?
[Khaddam] The issue has nothing to do with walking out of the conference or the failure to do so. We will say, as we always have said, that there is no room for forfeiting a single millimeter of Arab territory, and that there can be no peace unless there is a total Israeli withdrawal from all occupied Arab lands and unless the national rights of the Palestinian Arab people are secured. The mainstay of peace is a total Israeli withdrawal and guaranteeing the restoration of the Palestinian Arab people's national rights.

[Reporter] Your Excellency, yesterday the Syrian People's Assembly endorsed the Lebanese-Syrian security agreement concluded in accordance with the coordination, cooperation, and brotherhood treaty signed between the two countries. Does this mean Syria will defend Lebanon if Israeli aggressions are committed against it, in accordance with the aforesaid agreement?
[Khaddam] We have always supported Lebanon and will continue to do so. All the commitments we have with Lebanon will be honored. Therefore, as a matter of course, when there are significant things to be decided, they will be discussed by the Supreme Council formed by the two countries.

[Reporter] It is being said that Israel might demand the conclusion of an agreement similar to the 17 May agreement. What would be the position adopted then?
[Khaddam] To the best of my knowledge, there is a Lebanese consensus rejecting such demands.

[Reporter] The Israeli prime minister insists that the bilateral negotiations must be held in Israel and Arab capitals. It is well known that the Arab states oppose this. What is your position on this? Do you accept the idea of Cairo serving as a venue for the talks as a compromise?
[Khaddam] All the talks that took place between us and the U.S. side centered on fixing a venue for the conference, a venue for the whole process. Agreement was reached that Madrid would be the venue. Hence, our position is that this process, including all of its phases, must be completed in Madrid. We stick to this position.

[Reporter] Do you expect an imminent aggression against Lebanon in light of the escalating statements, as well as the fact that the enemy war minister always hints that Syria has a relationship that leaves operations against the Israelis to Hizballah or some other party?
[Khaddam] The mere fact that there is occupation is in itself an act of aggression. Occupation in itself is an act of aggression. Regarding resistance operations in the south, however, this is a legitimate right recognized by the UN Charter. Every people whose territories are occupied have the right to resist occupation with all the means they have.

[Reporter] Mr. Vice President, do you expect that the talks at the Madrid conference will take a long time, or that these talks will move to another positive level?
[Khaddam] It is difficult to judge this. However, it is clear that the obstacles Israel is placing in the way are big ones. When Shamir says the land does not belong to the Arabs, and he clings to them, and when he compares the area of Palestine and the other occupied Arab territories, on the one hand, and the area of the Arab homeland, on the other, this means he plans to continue the Israeli occupation. This in itself constitutes a big obstacle. How will this obstacle be resolved? We should wait and see what efforts the sponsors of the conference will make to convince the Israelis that they should abide by the implementation of the resolutions of international legitimacy.

[Reporter] In your opinion, are the Madrid talks going to take a long time?
[Khaddam] They might take a long time, or they might end. This depends on the Israeli side.

[Reporter] Your Excellency, the Syrian negotiator at the conference hinted that the American side has disavowed the promises it made to Syria.
[Khaddam] No, in the statement the Syrian foreign minister made in Madrid, he said the American side has not disavowed its promises. He met with President Bush who stressed to him that the United States was still committed to the letter of assurances he sent to Syria. When we feel there is a serious disavowal of this letter, then we will discuss the issue at that time and do what we should do to protect our national and pan-Arab interests.

[Reporter] Mr. Vice President, concerning the bilateral talks, now that this issue is still being debated, will the bilateral talks begin after agreement is reached on the principle of restoring the land, or will they begin, along with the regional talks, before this?
[Khaddam] First, I am talking about Syria and not about Lebanon. The Lebanese issue is based on the implementation of Resolution 425. As for Syria, the peace process is based on the implementation of UN Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338. Consequently, the discussions that will take place must be based on the foundations of the conference itself; namely, the implementation of these two resolutions. Naturally, this is an issue that will

be discussed during the bilateral talks which are expected to take place if an agreement is reached on the venue of the meeting. However, regarding the multilateral negotiations, we reject such negotiations because they give Israel everything it wants, and even more than it wants. This is an obstacle to peace. When Israel takes what it wants, I then will have no pressuring card to achieve the Israeli withdrawal. Therefore, we wish that the Arab brothers, who might be invited to such negotiations, will realize the danger posed by such an issue against all the interests and the future of the Arab nation.

[Reporter] Tehran has announced that all those who participate in the conference have condemned themselves to death. In other words, the Arabs have condemned themselves to death. What is your comment on this?
[Khaddam] I have not heard such a statement from any Iranian official. The relations between us and our friends in Iran are good, and there are continuous contacts and full cooperation between the two countries. I think that you have heard the speeches that were delivered at the Tehran conference, President Rafsanjani's speech, and the other Iranian officials' statements. In light of this, we cannot judge what is published by this newspaper or that news agency.

[Reporter] Mr. Vice President, in general, are you optimistic or pessimistic over the success of the conference?
[Khaddam] What is your opinion? [laughs] We hope that the conference will succeed. However, what we know about the objectives of the Zionist movement and Israel's aggressive policy is not encouraging.

[Reporter] Thank you.
[Khaddam] Thank you.

More on Visit, News Conference

NC3110184491 Beirut Radio Lebanon in Arabic 1630 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Text] Syrian Vice President 'Abd-al-Halim Khaddam held a news conference in Beirut today at 1700. He said that the basis of peace in the Middle East is total Israeli withdrawal and a guarantee of Palestinian rights.

In answer to a question, he said: Our discussions with the Americans focused on determining the venue of the conference. Madrid was agreed upon. He said all stages of the talks must be held in Madrid.

Khaddam remarked that the Israeli Prime Minister's speech brought nothing new and expressed the aggressive Zionist policy based on expansion, building settlements, and expelling citizens.

On the Lebanese issue, Khaddam said the instructions the Lebanese Government gave to its delegations were to discuss implementation of UN Security Council Resolution 425 on the grounds that the Israeli occupation of the south is a separate matter from the Arab-Israeli conflict.

The Syrian vice president said Syria is committed to implementing every agreement it has made with Lebanon. On Syria's support for the resistance, Khaddam said that in accordance with the UN Charter, all people whose territory is occupied have the right to resist occupation by all possible means.

Khaddam arrived at the presidential office in al-Ramla al-Bayda' this morning, accompanied by Major General Ghazi Kan'an. They were received by President al-Hirawi. They were later joined by Prime Minister 'Umar Karami, Michel al-Murr, deputy prime minister and minister of defense, and Chamber of Deputies Speaker Husayn al-Husayni.

President al-Hirawi hosted a luncheon in honor of Khaddam. This was attended by al-Husayni, Ministers al-Murr and Muhsin Dallul, Suhayl Shammas, the Foreign Ministry's secretary general, and Gen. Kan'an. At 1530 they were joined by Minister of State 'Abdallah al-Amin. Ministers al-Murr and Dallul left the meeting and it was reported that they had left for Prime Minister Karami's residence. They then returned with Prime Minister Karami and Gen. Kan'an. A second session of talks was then held.

Fatah Official Denies Coup Attempt in Camp

NC2510122291 (Clandestine) Voice of the People in Arabic to Lebanon 1130 GMT 25 Oct 91

[Text] The office of Kamal Midhat, chief of the intelligence bureau of the Fatah Movement loyal to 'Arafat, has denied that any coup or rebellion took place in the 'Ayn al-Hulwah camp last night.

At a news conference in 'Ayn al-Hulwah camp at noon today, Midhat accused intelligence organs of promoting such news, which he described as untrue.

Midhat described Munir al-Maqdah, official in charge of 'Ayn al- Hulwah security, as a struggler who was at the forefront of many battles to defend the Palestinian camps. Midhat added: It is natural to expect such propaganda, particularly since we are at the threshold of the peace conference, which represents a battle to defend our rights.

For his part, Munir al-Maqdah described what had taken place as normal measures to tighten security around the movement's headquarters, particularly in the wake of the assassination campaign. He said: We insist on our leadership, from whom we take our orders.

SLA Leader Rejects Claim of Changing Conditions

PM3010122391 London AL-HAYAH in Arabic 27 Oct 91 p 8

[Interview with South Lebanon Army Commander Antoine Lahd by Shawqi al-Rayyis in Jazzin; date not given]

[Excerpts] [Al-Rayyis] Is Antoine Lahd an agent, a traitor, or a rebel?
[Lahd] That is not the kind of question I answer. However, I will answer you: In fact, I pay no attention to such descriptions, whether they are intended to detract or to praise. Politicians in this country have accustomed us to such talk. Actually they exchange these descriptions

among themselves in their daily statements. I am entrusted with this area and will not abandon its security and the safety of its people. That is what concerns me.

[Al-Rayyis] Who entrusted you?
[Lahd] Its people, and the security conditions surrounding it, and the danger that what happened to neighboring and remote areas might happen to it.

[Al-Rayyis] But the conditions have changed today: The militias have been disarmed and the legitimate army is deploying in the areas, and citizens welcome and applaud these measures. What prevents the army's entry into the Jazzin area?
[Lahd] Very simply and clearly, what prevents the army from entering the Jazzin area is the fact that the conditions you talk about have not changed. Officials' statements do not concern me. What concerns me is what actually exists on the ground.

[Al-Rayyis] What are the conditions which have not changed?
[Lahd] We cannot begin from the end. I will not reveal my conditions. Let us begin negotiation first, then every party can present its conditions and views.

[Al-Rayyis] Do you mean by that that your first condition is that the state should enter directly into negotiations with you along the same lines as it did with the other warlords, that is to recognize you?
[Lahd] I do not need anyone's recognition, nor am I a warlord. I have not attacked people's property, made people homeless, or expelled anyone. And I am not after a post or anything else. But if there is a withdrawal, it must be preceded by negotiations in which conditions and guarantees should be specified. Without that, withdrawal is out of the question.

[Al-Rayyis] Has the state made any contact with you?
[Lahd] None at all.

[Al-Rayyis] Perhaps because it believes that the crucial decision is not in your hands but in Israel's?
[Lahd] Its lack of farsightedness and realism does not surprise me. And as long as it continues this policy, the situation will not change.

[Al-Rayyis] What are the conditions which you believe should be met in order for the situation to change?
[Lahd] Why do you want to expose my cards before any negotiations are held? What is important is that I am not convinced of, nor do I have confidence in what they are offering to delude people, namely the claim that security, peace, and legitimacy have been restored. They are talking about the army's return. Where is that army, and where is its authority? The army returned to al-Shuf, but the ruler there is still Walid Junblatt. The army returned to east Sidon, but citizens and evacuees have not returned because they do not feel confident or secure. The Palestinians have been deprived only of part of their arms. In such circumstances I believe that it is very difficult for the situation to change. What would happen if I withdrew from Jazzin and then its people suffered what the Christians in al-Shuf or east Sidon suffered? Who is going to defend them? Who is going to return their village to them? The army is present in Kafr Falus, and they are still carrying out sabotage operations and infiltration attempts. [passage omitted]

[Al-Rayyis] Are you prepared to consult the people of the area to know whether they want you to stay or want legitimacy to be restored?
[Lahd] I need to consult no one. I know what people in the region want. I am in constant and direct contact with them. But you should not listen to the merchants who say that, if the Sidon-Jazzin road is opened, the area will prosper and they will make profits. What is important is what the ordinary citizen wants and feels. He wants his safety and the safety of his family. This is the general feeling today. [passage omitted]

Al-Hirawi Comments on Paris, Rome Talks

NC2910101291 Beirut Voice of Lebanon in Arabic 0615 GMT 29 Oct 91

[Text] President al-Hirawi commented on the results of his tour on the plane which carried him back to Beirut from Rome last night. He said: Regarding France, there were some summer clouds between us, and there were no benevolent mediators to actually convey our distress over what was conveyed to us about the French Government's stand.

Al-Hirawi added: My meeting with President Mitterrand was very successful. We discussed all issues with absolute frankness. The French president's face carried signs of relief. He told me: God protect you. Continue your action along the same course. We have supported al-Ta'if, and will continue to do so.

Al-Hirawi added: Whenever there is talk about a date for the withdrawal, or rather redeployment of the forces of fraternal Syria, I have often repeated, and I repeat now, that I have been asked to start preparations and alert the government that they could bring forward the date for their redeployment in al-Biqa' region as stipulated in the al-Ta'if agreement. But we are hesitant about submitting this request until our personal forces become capable of performing their role in the Lebanese arena.

Regarding the Food and Agriculture Organization, President al- Hirawi explained: I asked [organization head] Dr. Sawma to stop sending food aid to Lebanon and instead to begin sending developmental aid, which helps the Lebanese farmer, helps bring Beirut's silos back to full capacity, and helps the Tall-'Amarah laboratories in al-Biqa' and al-Fanar animal laboratories. In addition, this aid would rehabilitate irrigation projects and revive agriculture in all regions.

On talks in the Vatican, President al-Hirawi said: We thanked his beatitude the pope for his concern over Lebanon and his comprehensive view regarding Christian-Muslim reconciliation

In Italy, talks centered on developmental issues and loans. An Italian delegation will travel to Lebanon to continue these discussions. .

Assembly Ratifies Defense Agreement With Lebanon

JN3010154591 Damascus Syrian Arab Republic Radio Network in Arabic 1215 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Excerpt] The People's Assembly, under the chairmanship of Speaker 'Abd-al-Qadir Qaddurah, continued its meetings this morning. It was attended by some of the ministers.

The Assembly heard reports by the committees for national security, interior, local administration, Arab affairs, and foreign affairs on the draft law concerning ratification of the defense and security agreement between the Syrian Arab Republic and the Lebanese Republic, which was signed in Shatawrah on 1 September 1991, in implementation of the Brotherhood, Cooperation, and Coordination Treaty between the two sisterly countries.

Following intensive discussions by the members, the Assembly ratified the draft law of the agreement. A number of members remarked that ratification of the agreement is a national and pan-Arab duty due to the nature of relations between the twin countries, Syria and Lebanon, and in view of the fact that the security of Syria is part of the security of Lebanon and the security of Lebanon is part of the security of Syria, and their people are one people in two countries. They added that it is a step toward consolidating and realizing the unity of the Arab nation and eliminating the factors of division, and toward establishing the unified Arab state.

The speakers stressed that the agreement guarantees the political stability which Syria, under the leadership of al-Asad, succeeded to secure in Lebanon by helping it to overcome the painful ordeal that was threatening its destiny and to realize the national Lebanese reconciliation.

Interior Minister Dr. Muhammad Harbah said the agreement is in implementation of the articles of the Brotherhood, Cooperation, and Coordination Treaty between Syria and Lebanon, which was signed by Presidents Hafiz al-Asad and Ilyas al-Hirawi. [passage omitted]

Khaddam Returns From Talks in Lebanon 31 Oct

JN3110215791 Damascus Syrian Arab Republic Radio Network in Arabic 2115 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Excerpt] Vice President 'Abd-al-Halim Khaddam returned to Damascus this evening at the conclusion of a brief visit to Beirut. During his visit, he met with Lebanese President Ilyas al-Hirawi, Chamber of Deputies Speaker Husayn al-Husayni, and Prime Minister 'Umar Karami. [passage omitted]

Territories' Return 'Basic Condition' for Peace

JN2610143991 Damascus Syrian Arab Republic Radio Network in Arabic 1230 GMT 26 Oct 91

[Station commentary]

[Text] Esteemed listeners: As 30 October approaches, when the Madrid peace conference on the Middle East will begin, many world leaders have expressed the hope that reason, wisdom, and conscience will overcome grudges, ambitions, and sick illusions, so that the parties involved in the Arab-Israeli conflict can achieve a just and comprehensive settlement, and create an opportunity for progress and stability in the region.

The truth is that the daily behavior of the Israeli prime minister, especially considering his refusal to withdraw from the occupied Arab territories and recognize the Palestinian people's rights, has dissipated many hopes. Yitzhaq Shamir's decision to lead the Israeli delegation and the fact that the delegation is composed of extremist Zionists, have increased the fears of all parties responsible for the establishment of peace in the Middle East.

Political analysts and commentators inside and outside Israel have been unanimous in the belief that Shamir is going to Madrid to sabotage and torpedo the conference, and pass up a unique opportunity for peace that might not be available again for a long time.

Such a crazy, sinful act is not out of the ordinary for the Israeli prime minister. He has always opposed all peaceful efforts in the region and announced on several occasions that Israel will not withdraw from its territories, referring to Jerusalem, the Golan Heights, the West Bank, and the Gaza Strip. In fact, Shamir is now threatening to withdraw from the Madrid conference if the question of the occupied territories is raised.

It is obvious for anyone observing Shamir's actions and practices that he is not concerned with peace. Shamir, like Sharon, views peace as detrimental to Israel's expansionist schemes and the dream of Greater Israel. Shamir, moreover, has been careful not to include Foreign Minister David Levi as part of the Israeli delegation because Levi, as commentators have noted, has shown some responsiveness to U.S. peace proposals.

Under such circumstances, it is natural, therefore, that the Madrid negotiations will experience crises and difficult times. The Arabs are going to the conference with a sincere desire to establish a just and comprehensive peace based on Resolutions 242 and 338 that stipulate Israeli withdrawal from the occupied territories and recognize the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and free, honorable lives.

At the recent Damascus conference, which included the parties directly involved with the Arab-Zionist conflict and representatives of the Gulf Cooperation Council and the Arab Maghreb Union, the Arabs reasserted their definite readiness to establish a lasting peace, in accordance with international resolutions that have repeatedly called for stopping settlement-building in the occupied territories, exchanging these territories for peace, and ensuring legitimate Palestinian rights.

Instead of showing a similar sincere desire, however, Israeli leaders, primarily Shamir, are provoking the

Arabs daily by asserting their expansionist ambitions and determination to Judaize and swallow up the occupied territories.

The Arabs are not going to participate in the Madrid conference just to hear speeches about Shamir's aggressive schemes or to give up their territories or rights; they are going to the conference to implement international resolutions, within the context of a U.S.-Soviet commitment to achieve a just and comprehensive settlement on all fronts that restores their usurped rights and territories.

In the Damascus meeting, plans were also drawn up by the Arabs to coordinate their stands so as to make it impossible for the enemy to infiltrate any gap and strike at the unity of Arab ranks.

The occupied Arab territories and Palestinian rights constitute a holy unity and represent the core of the raging conflict in the region; there will be no bargaining over these points.

Where the Israeli leaders repeat on every occasion that they will not negotiate the return of the occupied territories, the Arabs, for their part, consider the return of these territories to be a basic condition for peace. Israel, therefore, cannot interpret UN resolutions the way it pleases. The international community, represented by the United Nations, the United States, the Soviet Union, and Europe, is asked to provide the correct interpretation of these resolutions. The international community has indeed done so when it called on Israeli leaders to stop building settlements and return the occupied territories in exchange for peace.

The international community is asked to intervene constantly in the negotiations to prevent Israel from making the Madrid conference digress from its objectives and course, thereby destroying it. A wager on peace is today a wager on the international community, its credibility and efficacy.

Commentary Calls For 'Great Efforts' for Peace

JN0111073991 Damascus Syrian Arab Republic Radio Network in Arabic 1230 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Station commentary]

[Text] Gentlemen: On the second day of the Madrid peace conference, it can be said that the objectives for which the peace conference was convened will not be achieved by magic or simply by having the parties to the Middle East conflict sit together at one table under the sponsorship of the United States and the USSR. Moreover, overcoming the sticky points of the Middle East conflict requires great efforts over a long period of time, during which time all forces inside and outside the region should join hands to achieve a just, comprehensive solution and spare the region the dangers and woes of wars.

On the second day, it can also be said that the road to peace remains clear and that the foundations of peace have not changed as effective international forces have envisioned them and in accordance with UN resolutions in general, and Resolutions 242 and 338 in particular, and the land-for-peace principle.

Perhaps a quick look at what was said over the past 24 hours at the conference and its peripheries will clearly indicate that the Arabs went to Madrid depending on constant foundations that can be used as a basis for the success of the peace process and its objectives, and that the Arabs do not have anything to relinquish or bargain over, so long as their territories are occupied and their rights are denied.

Perhaps everyone has heard what was said by President Bush, Soviet President Gorbachev, and the EC representative, to the effect that the principles we took with us to Madrid represent the framework of action and the essence at the peace conference. Any manipulation or deception in relation to these constants, under any circumstances, eventually will manipulate and deceive the fate of the region and peace, and destroy the Madrid conference.

For the peace conference in Madrid is, by all definitions and interpretations, a victory for international legitimacy and a response to the will of the international community. Therefore, the conference must be the incubator in which the resolutions of international legitimacy see daylight, and in which the convictions and will of the international community will be realized. Foremost of these resolutions is the resolution that does not admit the occupation and possession of territory by force.

It is not difficult for anyone to realize that the territories under occupation today are for the Arabs and that the last four decades have witnessed one of the most painful tragedies; namely, the tragedy of the Palestinian Arab people, who were evicted from their territory, denied their rights, and who suffered the cruelest kinds of oppression and suppression. Talk about peace should not digress from the context of addressing these two abnormal situations: the occupied territories and the tragedy of the Palestinian people, on the bases of international legitimacy and the foundations on which the discussions of the peace process have been held over the past eight months.

Peace in the Middle East deserves all our efforts and energies to pursue work. The opportunity now is for everybody inside and outside the region. The outcome of this opportunity will decide the future of the region for many years to come and the future of coming generationsm, which are looking forward to living in freedom and dignity without the threat of aggression and fear for their security and destiny.

Bangladesh

Classes Suspended Until 7 Nov at Dhaka University

BK3110164491 Dhaka Radio Bangladesh Network in English 1530 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Text] The Dhaka University authorities today extended the suspension of classes and examinations up to 7 November in view of the prevailing campus tension. The decision was taken at an emergency meeting of the syndicate this evening with Vice Chancellor Moniruzzaman Mian in the chair.

Haji Kalab Ali college at Kamarkhand in Sirajganj District was closed for an indefinite period today following a clash between two rival student groups. Ten persons are reported to have been injured in the clash.

Security Tightened After Ayodhya Incidents

Hindu Areas Patrolled

BK0111085091 Hong Kong AFP in English 0833 GMT 1 Nov 91

[Text] Dhaka, Nov 1 (AFP)—Bangladesh tightened security in Hindu dominated areas here Friday after a youth group threatened to protest incidents surrounding a sacred mosque in neighbouring India's Ayodhya District, residents said.

"A large police contingent has been deployed in key Hindu areas and temples in Dhaka and in other districts," Shapan Shaha, a leader of the minority community said.

He said tension mounted after an unknown group calling itself "Juba Parishad" (Youth Council) distributed leaflets and put up posters on walls in the old parts of the capital Tuesday urging Moslems to take revenge against Hindu action in India to demolish the 16th century Babri Mosque.

The Moslem threat comes amid regular newspaper reports highlighting recent Hindu agitation in Ayodhya to pull down the mosque and replace it with a shrine to the Hindu god Rama, who is said to have been born at the site.

About 12 percent of Moslem Bangladesh's 110 million people are Hindus.

Shaha said they informed Home Minister Abdul Matin Chowdhury Wednesday about the propaganda and that they were now satisfied with the security measures taken, but his community members were still "tense" because of a planned anti-Hindu march after Friday mass prayers.

"There cannot be any permanent settlement by demolishing mosques or temples," he added.

Several hundred Moslems chanting slogans against Hindu action in Ayodhya started to march later Friday after prayers towards the old parts of the capital followed by several truckloads of police, witnesses said.

In November last year, communal riots over the same issue left at least four people dead and many temples in Dhaka and other places damaged.

The opposition political groups had then alleged that they were instigated by deposed President Hussain Mohammad Ershad's Jatiya Party to divert attention from anti-government agitation.

Hindus and Moslems had previously lived together peacefully, despite a few incidents, since the sub-continent's 1947 division into India and East and West Pakistan.

Bangladesh, formerly East Pakistan, became an independent country in 1971.

Police Disperse Muslim Protesters

BK0111105291 Hong Kong AFP in English 1036 GMT 1 Nov 91

[Excerpts] Chittagong, Bangladesh, Nov 1 (AFP)—Police opened fire and used batons here Friday to disperse several hundred angry Moslems protesting Hindu-led incidents at the site of a sacred mosque in neighbouring India.

About 50 demonstrators were injured during the one-hour clash which started after they tried to march down a major road of this southeastern port city chanting "Moslems of the world unite" and "Allahu Akbar" (Allah is great).

An AFP correspondent on the scene said police immediately swung into action, firing shots into the air and baton charging the procession, forcing the protestors to disperse.

The protest had started at a mosque in the Anderkillah area, and a second clash took place Friday in front of the city's press club when the protestors tried to organise a rally.

Police were guarding Hindu areas of the city as paramilitary Bangladesh Rifle guards patrolled the city in trucks.

Police detained at least 20 people in Chittagong. [passage omitted]

The Moslem threat came amid regular newspaper reports highlighting the Hindu agitation in Ayodhya. Moslems are the largest minority in Hindu-majority India, while about 12 percent of overwhelmingly Moslem Bangladesh's 110 million people are Hindus.

"A large police contingent has been deployed in key Hindu areas and temples in Dhaka and in other districts," Shapan Shaha, a Hindu community leader in the Bangladeshi capital said.

He said tension mounted after the youth group distributed leaflets and postered walls in the old part of the capital Tuesday, urging Moslems to take revenge against Hindu attempts to demolish the mosque.

Shaha said Hindus had informed Home Minister Abdul Matin Chowdhury of the propoganda provocations and were now satisfied with the security measures being taken.

But "there cannot be any permamnent settlement by demolishing mosques or temples," Shaha said.

Chowdhury addressed Moslems at Friday prayers at Dhaka's Lalbagh Shahi Mosque, witnesses said, but details were not immediately available. [passage omitted]

India

Security at Ayodhya Tightened; Strike Called

BK0111091091 Delhi All India Radio Network in English 0830 GMT 1 Nov 91

[Text] In the temple town of Ayodhya, security measures have been tightened. An additional platoon of the special protection force of the PAC [Provincial Armed Constabulary] trained in unarmed combat has been deployed inside the disputed shrine. The state police director general accompanied by top police and district administration officials visited the Ram Janmabhoomi-Babri Masjid [temple-mosque] complex this morning and took stock of the situation.

The police stood guard in Faizabad city as local units of the Babri Masjid Action Committee, Janata Dal, SJP and CPI [Samajwadi Janata Party and Communist Party of India] called for a bundh [strike] today to protest against yesterday's incident at Ayodhya.

Meanwhile, the Bharatiya Janata Party has appealed to what it described as pseudo-secular groups led by Mr. M.J. Akbar to refrain from inflaming communal tension in Ayodhya. In a statement issued in New Delhi today, the party secretary, Mr. J. P. Mathur, alleged that these forces have blown out of proportion yesterday's incident in Ayodhya.

Iran

PRC's Yang Shangkun Arrives in Tehran 30 Oct

LD3010122191 Tehran Voice of the Islamic Republic of Iran First Program Network in Persian 1030 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Text] Heading a high-ranking diplomatic-economic delegation, Mr. Yang Shangkun, the Chinese president, arrived in Tehran this morning on an official, three-day visit. He was formally welcomed by President Hashemi-Rafsanjani, Foreign Minister Velayati, Finance Minister Nurbakhsh, a number of political and economic officials, and heads of foreign missions in Tehran. At the welcoming ceremony, after the countries' national anthems were played, the Chinese president inspected the guard of honour.

At the Tehran airport, in an interview he expressed his pleasure with the visit and said: This visit is at the formal invitation of Mr. Hashemi-Rafsanjani, the president of the Islamic Republic of Iran, and in response to the visit three years ago by His Eminence Ayatollah Khamene'i to China when he was president.

He added: More than 20 years have passed since the establishment of diplomatic relations between the two countries. Those relations have always been good and have greatly improved, particularly in recent years.

Saying that during this trip he would meet His Eminence Ayatollah Khamene'i, the guardian of the Muslims' cause, the Chinese president said that the aim of the visit was to meet old friends and make new ones and to expand mutual ties and cooperation. He said that during his trip he would also visit the ancient and famous city of Esfahan.

In a short interview, regarding the existing grounds for cooperation between the two countries, President Hashemi-Rafsanjani referred to the extensive cooperation in recent years. He said: After the victory of the Islamic revolution, we chose China as our partners, and I went to China during the war. On the whole, it seemed that we could regard China as one of our good partners.

He added: During the visit to China by His Eminence Ayatollah Khamene'i, the great leader of the Islamic revolution, which took place while he was president, relations between the two countries were strengthened. And now we see numerous grounds for cooperation between the two countries.

He said: With this trip we have come closer to our goals of expanding scientific, economic, cultural, and international cooperation, especially regarding Asian issues, which have gained a particular direction in the new global conditions. We believe that our talks could be effective, and affect the situation.

Meets With Hashemi-Rafsanjani

LD3110131591 Tehran Voice of the Islamic Republic of Iran First Program Network in Persian 1030 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Text] Dear listeners, as we informed you at the beginning of the news program, the first round of official talks between the presidents of Iran and China was held today.

Referring to the need for more coordination and cooperation between the two countries under the existing world conditions, our country's president expressed his satisfaction with the existing cooperation, which shows an upward trend.

He then added: We think that the potential for cooperation between the two countries in all areas—politics, economics, commerce, technical, and scientific—is more than what we accomplish at present. We hope to see China taking an active role during Iran's era of reconstruction.

Referring to the fact that United States and some other countries were unhappy to see cooperation between Iran and China expand, Mr. Hashemi-Rafsanjani said: The Americans and some others are not happy to see our friendly cooperation. Through mendacious propaganda and propaganda blackmail, they intend to accuse us of secret cooperation in the manufacture of atomic weapons. They do not want to understand that we, in Asia, intend to stand on our own feet and solve our problems on our own.

On the new world order and the United States' role, our country's president said: What strikes the mind is that the Americans interpret the new world order to mean an opening for them to interfere more in the affairs of other countries. They imagine that having eliminated the power of their rival, they now have a license to interfere any where and in any way they wish.

We see in our own region that the United States signs military accords with small countries such as Kuwait and Bahrain to impose its military presence on the region. That means the United States has decided to monopolize the world's oil and energy sources; that is, she intends to control the most important resource the world. This is dangerous for all the world. Or, to cite an example, Mr. Bush delivers a one-sided speech at the Madrid conference; while he explicitly emphasizes the security for Israel, he fails to place any emphasis on the usurped Palestinian territories. Or, in a very provocative way, they interpret friendly cooperation between the countries to mean a drive toward the manufacture of atomic weapons. They resort to all these attempts to make the new conditions conducive to their inteferring in the affairs of any country they wish. The United States cannot even tolerate cooperation among European countries in providing for their own security.

We are definitely opposed to such interpration of the new world order. We believe the United States must be made to give up such thoughts.

The president of the Republic added: In our view, the plan for the new world order must contain such matters as non-interference in the will and independence of others and respect for the rights of nations and countries, whether small or large, strong or weak, to determine their own fates.

We must make the United States understand that today one cannot use the deceptive weapon of disarmament to threaten other countries and interfere in their internal affairs.

Then Mr. Yang Shangkun, while expressing delight at his trip to Tehran and referring to the close relations between Iran and China, said: Your visit to China six years ago opened a new chapter in relations between the two countries, and the visit of His Eminence Ayatollah Khamene'i strengthened cooperation between the two countries. China and Iran are among the countries of the Third World and share common views on most issues. Consultations and harmony between the two countries' high-ranking officials in the areas of bilateral, regional, and international issues is highly important.

China places special value and respect on cooperation with the Islamic Republic of Iran. The president of China added: In spite of the fact that some people are not happy about China and Iran's healthy and close relations, we are determined to expand relations in all fields. We are happily prepared to participate in the reconstruction of Iran.

The president of China then described the talks he had with the president of Pakistan, adding: We believe relations between China, Iran, and Pakistan should expand all the more.

Regarding the proposed new world order, the Chinese president remarked: We believe that countries—big or small, rich or poor—should strive to bring about order on an equal footing and on the basis of non-interference in each others' affairs. In our opinion, developing countries should expand their economies and increase their strength in the face of any oppression. The lessening of the economic gap between countries should be included in the contents of the new order.

Recent events in the Soviet Union were also discussed at this meeting, and the presidents of the two countries emphasized greater stability of the Soviet Union's domestic situation to assist in preserving peace and security of the region and the world. At this meeting it was also emphasized that the people of Afghanistan should determine their own destiny.

Discusses Cooperation With Khamene'i

LD3110172491 Tehran IRIB Television First Program Network in Persian 1530 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Text] His Eminence Ayatollah Khamene'i, the leader of the Islamic revolution, received the president of China and his accompanying delegation this afternoon. At that meeting, which was also attended by President Hashemi-Rafsanjani and a number of both countries' ministers and officials, His Eminence Ayatollah Khamene'i welcomed the Chinese president and expressed his hope that Mr. Yang Shangkun's trip to Tehran will herald the further expansion of cooperation between the two nations.

In reply, the Chinese president voiced his deep pleasure over his meeting with the leader of the Islamic revolution. He termed his negotiations with Mr. Hashemi-Rafsanjani for the expansion of bilateral ties as fruitful.

At that meeting, His Eminence Ayatollah Khamene'i also stressed the need for the daily expansion of relations between the Islamic Republic of Iran and the Peoples' Republic of China.

Ahmad Khomeyni Urges Expanded Ties

LD0111105291 Tehran IRIB Television Second Program Network in Persian 1615 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Excerpts] PRC President Yang Shangkun, accompanied by the late imam's son, Hojjat ol-Eslam Seyyed Ahmad Khomeyni, yesterday visited the late imam's holy shrine to pay homage to his memory. [passage omitted]

Hojjat ol-Eslam Seyyed Ahmad Khomeyni expressed the hope for expanded ties between Iran and China, which he characterized as the two most powerful states among the Third World countries. He also stressed the need for the support of the Palestinian nation by the Third World countries, adding that in Iran's view, the Madrid Middle East peace conference is considered to be only in U.S. interests. [passage omitted]

Ties To Reduce U.S. 'Effectiveness'

LD3110152491 Tehran Voice of the Islamic Republic of Iran First Program Network in Persian 1057 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Unattributed commentary]

[Excerpts] Yang Shangkun, the 85-year-old Chinese president, who left Beijing last Thursday to visit Pakistan and Iran, arrived in Tehran yesterday. The Chinese president's entourage, composed of deputy prime ministers, the foreign minister, and the deputy minister of economic communication, shows that country's willingness to expand relations with Tehran.

During the visit, the first since the victory of the Islamic revolution, high-ranking officials of the two countries will discuss ways of expanding mutual ties and cooperation, and global and regional issues of interest to the two sides. [passage omitted]

The Chinese president's visit to Iran will strengthen the ties between the two countries, considering their longstanding bonds of friendship and common views on all issues. Informed political sources believe that considering the current global and regional conditions and the end of U.S.-Soviet global rivalry, the efforts of the heads of the two states, aimed at expanding cooperation and mutual understanding, are very important.

The similar positions of Iran and China on many international and regional issues stem from the favorable grounds for economic, diplomatic, and cultural cooperation and have strengthened the cooperation between the two countries on the domestic and international scene.

Our country's economic and trade relations with China, which has natural economic and social resources, have improved over the past few years. This year, the volume of trade between the two countries reached $314 million. [passage omitted]

One should, however, note that political cooperation constitutes an important part of the ties between the two countries. On that basis, as the two countries are in agreement on international issues, the talks between the Iranian and Chinese leaders is a suitable opportunity for the policies of the two countries to be reviewed in the face of global developments and the United States' new world order.

Over the past few years, particularly since the end of the cold war, Iran and China, by adopting policies independent of world powers and increasing their contacts with Third World countries, have increased regional cooperation in an attempt to reduce U.S. effectiveness in crises, while solving their own problems. Therefore, realizing that the Tehran-Beijing combination could be an effective power, active in regional issues, the United States has attempted to undermine cooperation between the two countries. On that basis, attacking these countries from various sides is one of Washington's aims, and the United States' recent pressure, particularly on China, under the pretext of arms and military technology having been delivered to countries in the region, could be regarded within that same context.

In any case, cooperation between the two countries in international issues, aimed at resolving many important global and regional problems and disputes, is undoubtedly beneficial in the present circumstances and will definitely help to maintain peace and stability in Asia and the world.

Daily Acclaims Yang's Visit

LD3010230591 Tehran IRNA in English 1532 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Text] Tehran, Oct. 30, IRNA—A morning daily here Wednesday editorialized on Tehran-Beijing relations and described today's visit of Chinese President Yang Shangkun to Tehran as "an important development in Sino-Iran ties."

The English-language 'KAYHAN INTERNATIONAL' wrote that the visit, the first by a Chinese head of state since the Islamic revolution in 1979, "attests to the deepening of the traditionally good relationship enjoyed by the two countries."

The article stressed that recent developments make the broadening of high-level dialogues between Tehran and Beijing of utmost importance.

"With the collapse of old power structures, and Soviet leaders dancing to the Western tune, cooperation between China and Iran is crucial," added the daily.

Both countries, the editorial noted, "seek an international order that provides peace and security for all nations. Iran could be Beijing's link to the Middle East, which is coveted by the West. China, meanwhile, remains as the center of gravity for developing countries."

The paper concluded by assuring: "Closer cooperation between Tehran and Beijing is surely a step in the right direction."

Thai Commerce Minister Arrives for Trade Talks

NC2810085491 Tehran Voice of the Islamic Republic of Iran First Program Network in Persian 0430 GMT 28 Oct 91

[Text] Thai Commerce Minister Amaret Sila-On arrived in Tehran this morning. In an interview with our correspondent, he said that he is here to participate in the first joint commercial-economic committee of the two countries and to hold talks with Iranian officials on further expanding commercial relations.

Briefs Habibi on ASEAN

NC3010195091 Tehran Voice of the Islamic Republic of Iran First Program Network in Persian 0430 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Text] The Thai commerce minister met with First Vice President Habibi yesterday and briefed him on the joint session of the ASEAN members and the formation of a free zone within the next 15 years.

Mr. Habibi said: In view of the long-standing ties between the two countries, we believe that relations with Asian and Far Eastern countries should expand and the Islamic Republic of Iran is ready to take the necessary steps for discussions among joint committees.

Economic Memorandum Signed

NC3010200391 Tehran Voice of the Islamic Republic of Iran First Program Network in Persian 0430 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Text] The Thai commerce minister left Tehran this morning after signing an economic memorandum of understanding. In an exclusive interview with our correspondent, the Thai commerce minister said that the results of this visit as far as expanding and strengthening bilateral relations were good. He added: These talks have opened a new chapter in Iranian-Thai commercial relations.

Commerce Minister Vahhaji also spoke about the outcome of the talks, the signing of the memorandum of understanding, and the volume of Iranian-Thai commerce, and said: The first joint session for expanding Iranian-Thai relations was successful. In this session it was decided that correspondent banking activities will be carried out directly and chambers of commerce will open offices in both countries to study areas of cooperation. It was also decided that all purchases will be carried out directly and that an air route for transporting goods will become operational. During the session the two sides also discussed the export of oil and traditional Iranian goods to Thailand and the purchase of sugar, rubber, and rice from Thailand.

The commerce minister added: During this visit 210,000 tonnes of rice was purchased for this year and next year from Thailand.

Moscow-Tehran Cargo Train Service Resumes

LD2910171391 Tehran Voice of the Islamic Republic of Iran First Program Network in Persian 1630 GMT 29 Oct 91

[Text] Cargo train service between Iran and the Soviet Union has been resumed after a period of interruption. According to a Central News Unit report from Tabriz, the Moscow-Tehran passenger train service will also start soon.

Musavi-Ardabili Urges Uprising Against Conference

NC0111112191 Paris AFP in English 1016 GMT 1 Nov 91

[Text] Tehran, Nov. 1 (AFP)—A senior Iranian religious leader Friday called for an Islamic uprising to protest the Middle East peace conference, assuring those who fell in the struggle they would go to heaven.

Ayatollah 'Abdol Karim Musavi-Ardebili, the former head of the Iranian Supreme Court, in a sermon during Friday prayers at Tehran University urged "Moslems of the world to rise up to save Islam and Palestine.

"If the enemies of Islam fall here and there, they will no longer be able to resist," he declared. "You are strong and you understand martyrdom," he told worshippers. "If you kill or are killed you will go to heaven.

"The Madrid conference has already yielded fruits for Israel. By sitting at the negotiating table with the Arabs it has got what it wanted. There is no chance for a confrontation between the governments of Arab countries and Israel and the United States, but if peoples form resistance cells they will be able to disturb their sleep."

Iranian officials and commentators have denounced the U.S.-brokered peace conference, describing it as treasonous to the Palestinian struggle.

On Wednesday, the opening day of the Madrid gathering, hardline MP Hojjat ol-Eslam 'Ali Akbar Mohtashemi, warned U.S. President George Bush and other participants that as "enemies of Islam" they had been condemned to death and would be killed by Moslem revolutionaries.

Conference 'Catalyst' for New Regional Tensions

NC3110133491 Tehran Voice of the Islamic Republic of Iran First Program Network in Persian 0430 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Central News Unit Research Group commentary]

[Excerpts] In the name of God. The so-called Middle East conference was inaugurated amid unprecedented security measures in the Spanish capital, Madrid. Besids the representatives of Arab neighbors of occupied Palestine and the Zionist regime, delegates from the United States, Soviet Union, the EC, Gulf Cooperation Council, Arab Maghreb Union, and the United Nations are also participating. Three phases have been planned for the conference. [passage omitted]

While the Arab countries are represented by their foreign ministers, the United States, Soviet Union, and the Zionist regime are represented at the highest level, indicating the key role and decisive part they play in directing the conference and its outcome.

Bush and Gorbachev, the U.S. and Soviet leaders, have made the event significant, because these two superpowers—since the Palestinian crisis began and the illegitimate Israeli regime was established—have had a role in any decisions concerning Israel; their policy politically consolidating and physically expanding the Zionist regime.

The Soviet Union and United States' debuts as superpowers after Word War II, the establishment of the Zionist regime in occupied Palestine, U.S.-Soviet coordination in 1947 and their pressure on the United Nations, led to the illegal resolutions for dividing Palestine and created the Zionist regime which they immediately recognized. [passage omitted]

The end to the cold war between the Soviet Union and the United States created new international needs, while the remains of confrontation and its crises were unravelled. In the Soviet-U.S. balance of power, these crises have tilted in Washington's favor, benefiting the capitalist world by placing the initiative in U.S. hands.

The Soviet and U.S. leaders' presence in Madrid, more than anything else, shows this reality and the prevailing world trend. In view of this trend, the regional turbulence caused by the Persian Gulf war, and the resulting general Arab feebleness, the Madrid conference will be directed and guided toward a compromise favoring the Zionist regime.

The conference and its course face two sets of problems: extensive popular opposition to any compromise with the Zionist regime and its official recognition—so vehement that the Arab regimes will not accept anything less than dazzling concessions and the Zionist regime's withdrawal from all areas on the West Bank, Gaza Strip, and Golan Heights.

Any compromise will heighten the people's discontent with the resulting political instability. This will not help the United States keep the area free from elements that create tension and turmoil. For this reason, the United States seeks a mechanism to steer an Arab-Israeli compromise away from any tension-creating repercussions.

U.S. efforts are faced with Israeli insistence on usurping Arab and Islamic territories, and it seems too farfetched to imagine that Washington will easily achieve the outcome it desires.

The Islamic world opposes the trend of compromise—direct or indirect—with the Zionist regime, and unannounced security measures have been taken in most Arab countries to prevent protests.

Unrest and demonstrations, mainly in Arab countries participating in Madrid, have led to scores of arrests and indicate the sentiments prevailing among regional nations. Similarly, Muslim Palestinian protest and its anti-Zionist revolutionary actions show that the Madrid conference will not resolve the Middle East crisis at its roots, but will be a catalyst to new regional tensions.

Media 'Praise' Conference, 'Ignore' Opposition

NC3110114491 Tehran Voice of the Islamic Republic of Iran First Program Network in Persian 0430 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Text] Under a preplanned program, Western news networks are striving to portray the Madrid conference as a symbol of friendship between the Arab nations and Zionists. Our special correspondent in Madrid reports on the conference atmosphere:

[Begin unidentified correspondent recording] While the U.S.-imposed Middle East peace conference is meeting in Madrid, Western media, particularly U.S. media and news agencies, is exerting great efforts to portray the conference as successful. More than 4,500 correspondents, including hundreds from U.S. radio and television networks and news agencies, have been filing a profusion of reports, news, and commentaries by international teleprinter from the venue IDEMA [expansion unknown], generally trying to bolster and praise the conference.

They are doing this and at the same time ignore general mourning, strikes, and protest demonstrations in the occupied Palestinian territories and other Islamic countries opposed to the conference. This is the Voice and Vision of the Islamic Republic of Iran in Madrid. [end recording]

Dailies Say Madrid Talks Betray Palestinians

LD2910092991 Tehran IRNA in English 0839 GMT 29 Oct 91

[Text] Tehran, Oct. 29, IRNA—Two leading morning newspapers Tuesday expressed deep concern over the betrayal of the Palestinian cause to be culminated at Madrid conference, to open Wednesday.

'JOMHURI-E ESLAMI' in its editorial titled 'Return to Colonialism' wrote that each step for formation of the 'Jewish state' had taken shape through the support and guidance of British colonialist tendencies. "Madrid conference is an open attempt of neo-colonialism for stabilization and recognition of a pseudo government which has been created by aliens in the heart of the oil-rich region of the world," the daily commented. Underlining the treacherous objective behind Madrid conference, the daily appealed to world Muslims to shoulder their grave responsibilities in their fight against plots of enemies of Islam.

The English-language daily 'TEHRAN TIMES' commenting on the same subject wrote: "The Madrid conference will go down in history as the most insidious example of injustice that has the support of the U.S. and its allies." For the Palestinian people, the daily noted, the conference simply sets yet another example of international hypocricy in dealing with their cause. Yet while there may be no space at Madrid for those favouring justice, the Zionist regime and its backers will do well to remember that time has always found a way to rebound on arrogant powers."

Karrubi Reiterates Support for Fatah Movement

LD2710171491 Tehran IRIB Television First Program Network in Persian 1530 GMT 27 Oct 91

[Text] Mr. (Abu-Munzar) from the Fatah Revolutionary Movement, accompanied by the ambassador of Palestine to Tehran, today met Mr Karrubi, the speaker of the Majles. Speaking of the international conference in support of the Islamic revolution of the Palestinian people, Mr. (Munzar) said: The shining conclusions of the conference have had a positive effect on the spirit of the Palestinian people in the occupied regions. The convening of the conference at this sensitive juncture is a tooth-breaking [as heard] reply to the Madrid conference.

In response, Mr Karrubi said: Support for the Islamic revolution of Palestine is one of the principles of the Islamic revolution of Iran. It is our duty. Expressing his concern over the pressures inflicted by the United States and Zionism against the Palestinian people, the speaker of the Majles added: Today, the Americans are impudently forcing their objectives on the Palestinian people. They use the polarity of the world to enforce their interventionist policies, especially against the Palestinian people.

'Priority' Placed on Improving Ties With Egypt

LD3010223991 Tehran Voice of the Islamic Republic of Iran First Program Network in Persian 1200 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Excerpts] In a recent meeting, the Foreign Relations Committee of the Majles reviewed the international reaction to the International Conference for Protection of Islamic Revolution of the People of Palestine held in Tehran. The result of the conference in supporting the Islamic revolution of the people of Palestine and the struggle of Muslims against Zionist aggressors was assessed to be successful. [passage omitted]

At the same meeting, the officer in charge of the Islamic Republic of Iran interests section in Cairo presented a full report on the political and economic situation in Egypt, as well as the widespread affection of the people of that country for the revolution and the Islamic Republic of Iran. In view of the fact that the Majles Foreign Relations Committee attaches a great deal of importance to having contacts with the Muslim people of Egypt, it proposed to the Foreign Ministry to consider improvement of ties with Egypt as a priority item.

Deputies Reject Upgraded Ties

LD0111091991 Tehran IRNA in English 1604 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Text] Tehran, Oct. 30, IRNA—Three members of the Majlis Foreign Relations Commission in a statement here Tuesday rejected that the commission had recommended the Foreign Ministry to upgrade ties with Egypt.

The statement, published by the morning daily ABRAR on Wednesday, said that the commission did not approve of the reports published by the mass media regarding the commission's recommendation on establishment of full diplomatic relations with Egypt. Rather, the remarks made were the personal views of the head of the Foreign Relations Commission. They were referring to last Monday reports that the commission had proposed to the Foreign Ministry to study, with a special priority, improvement of Tehran-Cairo relations. The statement, however, added that the commission members favored preserving Tehran-Cairo ties at the level of interests sections.

The commission members believe that Egypt is the pioneer of opening talks with the usurper Israel, the first Arab state in which the Israeli flag was hoisted and that presently the Cairo administration is the vanguard in implementation of the U.S. and Zionist plans in the Middle East, the so-called U.S. peace plan in particular, it stressed. "In light of these facts, we do not and will not believe in promotion of ties with Egypt and do not confirm the news printed," Ayatollah Sadeq Khalkhali, Qorban 'Ali Saleh Abadi and Ibrahim Asgharzadeh reiterated in their statement.

ABRAR in its editorial Tuesday wrote that the commission's proposal was "controversial" under the present circumstances. It noted that Iran gives priority to expansion of ties with Muslim countries. It asked whether it is not a contradictory move to improve ties with a lackey regime like Egypt on the eve of the so-called peace conference in Madrid. It suggested that establishment of ties with the Egyptian people is essential but asked whether such ties could have been established with the Islamic revolutionary Muslims of Egypt. The paper further asked whether the commission's proposal was not a move towards weakening the status of the Palestinian Muslims on the eve of the Madrid conference.

IRNA, SUNA Sign Cooperation Agreement

LD0111101391 Tehran IRNA in English 1008 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Text] Tehran, Oct. 31, IRNA—An agreement for cooperation between the Islamic Republic News Agency

(IRNA) and the news agency of Sudan (SUNA) was signed here Thursday morning by the managing directors of the two news agencies.

IRNA managing director Hoseyn Saferi and his Sudanese counterpart Tayyib Mustafa in their last round of talks before signing the agreement reviewed potentials for bilateral cooperation. Mustafa, who arrived here last Monday at the head of a delegation on a six-day visit, requested IRNA to assist SUNA.

According to the agreement, IRNA is to open a branch office in the Sudanese capital of Khartoum in the near future, train SUNA staff and provide it with technological assistance to help expand its activities.

Later in the day the Sudanese delegation left Tehran for the ancient city of Esfahan and will also travel to Shiraz, Fars Province.

Reaction to Mohtashemi Threat on Madrid

NC3110120991 (Clandestine) Iran's Flag of Freedom Radio in Persian 0645 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Text] According to news agencies, simultaneous with the inauguration of the Madrid Peace conference, 'Ali Akbar Mohtashemi, the former interior minister of the Islamic Republic of Iran and presently a Majles deputy, announced that the Madrid conference is a declaration of war against Islam, and that its participants, especially George Bush, are condemned to death. Mohtashemi said the participants are condemned to be killed and stressed that the orders for killing them will be implemented by revolutionary Muslims.

According to informed observers, Mohtashemi's remarks are in conformity with the Islamic Republic of Iran's position, according to which the conference was supposedly convened to support Palestine to rig up a display of opposition to the Madrid conference.

Meanwhile, the Jordanian foreign minister, who heads the Jordanian delegation to the Madrid conference, in the first reaction to Mohtashemi's threats, stated: We have come to Madrid to attain permanent peace.

'Combat Directives' Issued to University Students

NC3010134491 (Clandestine) Iran's Flag of Freedom Radio in Persian 0645 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Text] Combatants in the country yesterday distributed the locally produced Flag of Freedom Organization leaflet, containing combat directives for students at Tehran and Melli Universities.

Pakistan

Pakistan, India To Discuss Limiting Chemical Arms

BK3110155991 Islamabad Radio Pakistan Network in Urdu 1500 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Text] Pakistan and India have agreed to convene a meeting of experts to exchange views on a bilateral agreement to put restrictions on the production and use of chemical weapons. The agreement was reached at the fifth round of talks between the foreign secretaries of the two countries which ended in Islamabad today. They also agreed to consider issuing a joint communique on chemical weapons. The two sides further agreed to exchange coordination officers for nuclear installations and facilities before 1 January next year in view of the nonaggression pact between the two countries regarding each other's nuclear installations and facilities.

A statement was issued in Islamabad today which said that the two sides expressed satisfaction over the outcome of meetings between Shaharyar Khan and Muchkund Dubey on Wular Barrage and Sir Creek. They also held talks on the Siachen issue and agreed that the negotiations should be resumed soon. The sixth round of foreign secretary-level talks will be held in New Delhi early next year.

Scientists Enhance Capacity of Nuclear Reactor

BK3110163491 Islamabad Radio Pakistan Network in English 1600 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Text] Scientists and engineers of the Pakistan Atomic Energy Commission [PAEC] have successfully enhanced the powers of five-megawatt nuclear research reactor to 10 megawatt through modifications and improvements. The reactor became functional in its upgraded form today. This was announced by chairman of PAEC, Dr. Ashfaq Ahmed, at a ceremony at PINSTECH [Pakistan Institute of Nuclear Science and Technology] at Nilor near Islamabad this afternoon.

The federal minister for interprovincial coordination, Mr. Mohammad Aslam Khattak, who addressed the function as the chief guest, said the government would provide all necessary resources to develop nuclear technology.